

THE
SCOTT
LIBRARY





1762
R. A. Merriman



THE SCOTT LIBRARY.

SELECT ESSAYS OF JOHN HENRY
CARDINAL NEWMAN.

* * FOR FULL LIST OF THE VOLUMES IN THIS SERIES,
SEE CATALOGUE AT END OF BOOK.

SELECT ESSAYS OF JOHN HENRY
CARDINAL NEWMAN. WITH AN
INTRODUCTION BY GEORGE
SAMPSON.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., LTD.
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	vii
THE REFORMATION OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY .	i
PRIVATE JUDGMENT	67
JOHN DAVISON, FELLOW OF ORIEL	111
JOHN KEBLE	155
THE MISSION OF THE BENEDICTINE ORDER .	186
THE BENEDICTINE CENTURIES	240

INTRODUCTION.



A VOLUME in this series, entitled *University Sketches*, by Cardinal Newman, is prefaced by a somewhat lengthy Introduction, designed to arouse the interest of the general reader in the work of that great writer. A few of his books are described, and in some cases represented by quotation; while incidentally there are a few general remarks about his prose and verse. In an essay thus avowedly elementary, I preferred to say little about his life, because I thought my purpose would be better served by dealing with his writings only, and space would not permit a consideration of both. There, too, I stated my belief that a short sketch of his life is bound to be unsuccessful, since that life is not so much a tale of achievements, as the gradual development of a character, under impulses from within and influences from without. Such a life requires for its complete exhibition, the free space and well-filled stage of a novel; a brief account can do no more than select for notice a few facts and dates, and that is what I shall do here as a preface to this second volume of selections. The present introduction is not meant to be an integral part of the former, which, indeed, was out of my hands before this volume was even thought of. However, as I wrote there about Newman chiefly as a man of letters, and intend here to consider very briefly his life, the two together may serve

some modest purpose of use, in guiding onwards those readers, who find these selections from a great man's work attractive enough to encourage further explorations.

The life of John Henry Newman was almost coeval with the century that is just dead. He was born on the 21st of February 1801, in Old Broad Street, E.C. His father was a banker, his mother descended from a family of Huguenots. His bringing up was strictly religious, and sorted well with his disposition; but the future Cardinal was fed with strange food. The Calvinism of Scott's *Bible*, of *Newton on the Prophecies*, of Milner's *Church History*, can scarcely be said to point towards Rome; but all these writers had their great share in moulding his plastic youth. What that share was cannot be better told than in his own words:—

“The writer who made a deeper impression on my mind than any other, and to whom (humanly speaking) I almost owe my soul [was] Thomas Scott of Aston Sandford. . . . He followed truth wherever it led him, beginning with Unitarianism, and ending in a zealous faith in the Holy Trinity. It was he who first planted deep in my mind that fundamental truth of religion. . . . And for years I used almost as proverbs what I considered to be the scope and issue of his doctrine, ‘Holiness rather than peace,’ and ‘Growth the only evidence of life.’ . . . I read Joseph Milner's *Church History*, and was nothing short of enamoured of the long extracts from St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and the other Fathers which I found there. I read them as being the religion of the primitive Christians; but simultaneously with Milner I read *Newton on the Prophecies*, and in consequence became most firmly convinced that the Pope was the Antichrist predicted by Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John. My imagination was stained by the effects of this doctrine up to the year 1843; it had been obliterated from my reason and judgment at an earlier date; but the thought remained upon me as a sort of false conscience.”

Here, too, we must notice another most important statement:—

“When I was fifteen (in the autumn of 1816), a great change of thought took place in me. I fell under the influences of a definite Creed, and received into my intellect impressions of dogma, which, through God’s mercy, have never been effaced or obscured.”

I called this statement important, because of what is implied in the notion of dogma, or definite *credenda* of religion. From the fundamental truths of revealed religion spring forth other doctrines, and it soon becomes necessary to say which of various interpretations or developments is the right one. The shocks and storms that have raged round the almost innumerable heresies are part of the process of “natural selection” in dogma; and it is claimed that the doctrines which survive do so because they have in them the principle of true life, which the others, called heresies, have not. Let us consider such a passage as “The Word became Flesh and dwelt among us” (John i. 14).¹ What is the Word? Why so called? How “became”? What was the nature of this Incarnate Word? Was it both God and Man separately? Was it God and Man mingled in some Singular Nature? Was the Word always Human? Was the Humanity retained after the Resurrection? Questions of this sort make it plain that if there is to be a definite Creed, there must be infallible power of defining, some individual or body that, on the appearance of controversy, shall say finally, “This is right; that is wrong.” And so, when Newman received into his intellect the notion of a definite Creed, he made unawares his first great step towards Rome; for the Anglican Church has not many unmistakable *credenda*, nor has it the power or right of defining them more exactly. It was the gradual discovery of this that shattered

¹ I am indebted to some one for this illustration, I fancy to Newman himself, but I cannot give a reference.

his belief in the Church of his birth, and brought him, after a long struggle, into the Church of Rome.

In 1808 he was sent to Ealing School, famous in its day. He was very sharp, and quickly ran from bottom to top. His tastes were literary. He began writing in prose and verse at the age of eleven, and "took much pains in matter of style." To this labour he devoted his play-time, and he was never known to take part in any games. He read the tales of Miss Porter, Mrs. Radcliffe, and, above all, Sir Walter Scott, and from these, no doubt, got his first scent of a Catholic atmosphere. Music, too, was not forgotten. To the end of his days Newman was a good violinist; and it is pleasant to think of such a man playing for hours at a stretch in the quartets of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, the last of whom he thoroughly appreciated, a point of taste not too common in the early years of the nineteenth century.

From Ealing he went to Oxford, and was entered at Trinity before the end of his sixteenth year. In the following June he went into residence, and made the acquaintance of J. W. Bowden, a friendship that lasted unimpaired till Bowden's death in one of the darkest years of Newman's life. In 1820 he attempted to take his B.A. degree with honours, but to the astonishment of every one, himself included, he broke down, and barely gained the pass degree. However, he had his revenge. He resolved to become a candidate for an Oriel fellowship. Every one thought he was mad; but he succeeded. Oriel was at this time the leading college at the University, and here Newman met most of those who, in different ways, were to influence him so deeply. First there was Richard Whately—the archiepiscopal Christopher North, as I remember seeing him called—whose vigorous, boisterous personality shook out

all Newman's diffidence and shyness. Here is Newman's verdict on him :—

"I owe him a great deal. . . . He, emphatically, opened my mind, and taught me to think and to use my reason. . . . He had done his work towards me, or nearly so, when he taught me to see with my own eyes and to walk with my own feet."

Writing, in 1860, a note on an early letter of his to Whately, Newman puts the matter more bluntly by saying :—

"I used to propose to myself to dedicate a work to him, if I ever wrote one, to this effect : 'To Richard Whately, D.D., etc., who, by teaching me to think, taught me to differ from himself.' Of course more respectfully wrapped up."

Another man who helped to shape Newman's life was Dr. Hawkins, Vicar of St. Mary's, and afterwards Provost of Oriel. Of him Newman writes :—

"He was the first who taught me to weigh my words, and to be cautious in my statements. He led me to that mode of limiting and clearing my sense in discussion and in controversy, and of distinguishing between cognate ideas, and of obviating mistakes by anticipation, which, to my surprise, has since been considered, even in quarters friendly to me, to savour of the polemics of Rome. . . .

"There is one other principle which I gained from Dr. Hawkins, more directly bearing upon Catholicism than any I have mentioned, and that is the doctrine of Tradition. . . . He lays down a proposition, self-evident as soon as stated to those who have at all examined the structure of Scripture—viz., that the sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church, for instance, to the Catechism and to the Creeds."

The *Analogy* of Butler, read in the early 'twenties, had a marked effect on Newman's religious opinions: it gave him the notion of a visible Church and the duty of external religion; but, above all, it strengthened his youthful belief, that the visible world was an "Economy," a type,

almost sacramental, of the real unseen world. Then, too, Butler's doctrine that Probability is the Guide of Life took a strong hold on his mind, so strong, indeed, that hundreds of his pages are devoted in one way or another to developments of this doctrine, one book, *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*, being concerned practically with nothing else. All this, first thoroughly learned from Butler, was driven home by the writings and teachings of a new friend, John Keble, whose *Christian Year* was the first visible sign of that ecclesiastical revival with which the names of Newman and Keble will always be connected. Another dear friend of these years, bright, alert, versatile Hurrell Froude, helped to lessen his dislike for Rome, and to increase his dislike for violent Protestantism. However, what may be called Newman's period of passivity came to an end in 1828, when he became Vicar of St. Mary's. "It was to me," he said, "like the feeling of spring weather after winter; and, if I may so speak, I came out of my shell. I remained out of it till 1841."

In 1830 he began to work at his book on the Arians. This led him to the Fathers, who in time led him to Rome. In 1832 he set out on a European tour with the Froudes, father and son, and during this voyage many of the poems used as numbers of the *Lyra Apostolica* were written. After voyaging to the Archipelago and back to Italy, he separated from the Froudes and went to Sicily, and there, stricken with fever, alone in a strange land, he was mysteriously sustained by a belief that he had "a work to do in England," the work of teaching the English Church that it was really a Church, the work of waking the living meaning that lay slumbering and unsuspected beneath the words of its formularies. At last he recovered, and crossed to France. While becalmed, he wrote the immortal "Lead, Kindly Light," a poem that

brings with it a sense of tears and of joy, for it is a true cry of the heart.

“At length I got to Marseilles, and set off for England. The fatigue of travelling was too much for me, and I was laid up for several days at Lyons. At last I got off again, and did not stop, night or day (except a compulsory delay at Paris), till I reached England, and my mother’s house. My brother had arrived from Persia only a few hours before. This was on the Tuesday. The following Sunday, July 14th, Mr. Keble preached the Assize Sermon in the University Pulpit. It was published under the title of ‘National Apostasy.’ I have ever considered and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833.”

What was the Oxford Movement of 1833? That is a question impossible to answer in a short article, nor would these pages be a fit place for the attempt. I endeavour to indicate it briefly, by saying that it was an attempt to make Anglicans think rather of the “One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church” of the Nicene Creed, than of the “Church of England as by Law Established”; to lead them to trace their ecclesiastical descent, not from Queen Elizabeth, but from the Church of the Apostles, and the great Saints and Doctors of the early Christian centuries. It was an attempt to awaken a puissant and vigorous Christian life, by calling into being a sort of ecclesiastical patriotism, that sense of Church life which the Establishment has certainly never had at any time in its history. As I do not wish to be misunderstood, I will remark that Christian life and Church life are not the same thing; that one does not imply the other, though it is probable that a sense of Church life will have its effect on the religious life. Nothing is clearer than the pressing need in those days for some invigoration of the English Church. Against the advantages won by separation from Rome, must be set the miserable lethargy induced by the new order of

things. Earnestness seemed to die with the Non-jurors, and a complete arrest of life and function set in with the Hanoverian monarchs. The need for reform brought forth Wesley at Oxford, whose attempt to Protestantise the Church still further, ended in the definite separation of the Methodists from the decayed body of the Establishment. Then came Simeon at Cambridge; but the evangelicalism of this school obviously affected, not the Church as a whole, but that part of it lying nearest to Dissent, so that it tended to create further division, to drive people out of the Church rather than waken the whole mass into new life. In the days of Newman's youth the air was thick with plans of political reform, and it did not escape notice that the Church, too, had its Rotten Boroughs and its Virtual Representation. The union of Church and State had not been particularly successful for the Church as such; and so the hint of further interference brought into prominence a new High Church party, that looked with longing eyes back to the Church of the past, and prepared to meet further advances of Parliament in Church affairs with vigorous, Primitive opposition. Protestantism, they said in effect, has been tried and found wanting; it has seriously impaired the very life of the Church; let us go back, then, to Antiquity, to Catholicity. Now it should be clearly understood that Newman had nothing at all to do with the rise of this idea. It began to spring up before 1833, and its beginnings were felt at first in schools of thought with which Newman had little sympathy. He, as the foregoing pages have surely shown, was caught into the new movement: he did not begin it; but such a man as he could not stay long in the rear. The force of personality brought him to the front, and the Oxford Movement was thereafter associated chiefly with his name. It grew with

his growth, and began to die at his secession from the English Church.

It seems to me quite plain that the Oxford Movement did not last, and did not directly begin a new order of things. The extreme High Churchman of to-day has very little in common with the "Tractarian" of the 'thirties. The Oxford leaders tried to follow the path of the Primitive Church; the modern party runs parallel with modern Rome; and, just as the Oxford Movement led straight to Rome, and there only, so the extreme party of to-day, if it continue in its present course, will find nothing before it but separation into a new sect. It seems odd that the Oxford leaders did not see the futility of their retrogression. The Church of the second, third, fourth, even of the fifth century, may seem at first sight to differ in many ways from the Church of Rome as we know it to-day; but we cannot shut our eyes to history, and the fact remains that Leo the Thirteenth stands in the twentieth century, where in the fifth stood Leo the First. To go back to the Council of Nicæa is merely to postpone, and not to evade, a return to the Council of Trent. Still, though the logic of the Oxford Movement was Rome and nothing else, the Church of England gained something from it. There was a stir, there was indeed a "movement"; and out of the stress of it all, that enfeebled Church drew in new interests, new vigour, almost new life.

The members of the new party had set themselves a big task. On one side they were ranged against the Erastian or "Church and State" principle, while on the other they were opposed to "Liberalism" in religion—the anti-dogmatic principle, the notion that the actual *credenda* of faith were of little importance—a foe infinitely more dangerous, because such was and is the spirit of the last

hundred years. The Movement was quite informal. There was no organisation, no leader; there was not even agreement. Newman, it is clear, was the life and soul of the work. His energy was amazing. His letters written during these years stand by themselves; they seem to come from another, more vigorous, more hard-framed man. He began the *Tracts for the Times*, designed to diffuse the work of the party; he visited the country clergy, wrote letters to persons and papers. Very thoroughly did he realise the rather truculent motto of the *Lyra Apostolica*, "You shall know the difference now that I am back again." The milder men in the movement began to be alarmed, but Newman, encouraged by Keble, Froude, and Pusey (who came later into the work), went on, and carried numbers with him. His magical personality brought round him admiring disciples from young Oxford, so that, although he was by title a parish priest, his influence was chiefly at work amongst members of the University. The cry of Popery was raised against the Movement, but as a matter of fact Newman's "false conscience" made him so vehement against Rome, that Froude had to rebuke him for his "cursing and swearing." Newman, however, felt that they ought to define clearly their attitude towards Rome, and for this purpose set about his *Prophetical Office of the Church*, the indication of a *Via Media* between Rome and Protestantism. Indeed, he laboured with mind and pen almost without ceasing. The *Tracts* went on; sermons were preached and published, and his reading of the Fathers was widened and deepened. In 1839, he began to study the Monophysite controversy, the heresy that rose out of the doctrine implied by Eutyches that Christ had only one nature, a controversy that threatened to shatter Christendom, until the magnificent intervention of St. Leo

restored order if not peace. It was during a study of this question that he felt his first doubt about the soundness of Anglicanism.

“I have described in a former work how the history affected me. My stronghold was Antiquity; now here, in the middle of the fifth century, I found, as it seemed to me, Christendom of the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries reflected. I saw my face in that mirror, and I was a Monophysite. The Church of the *Via Media* was in the position of the Oriental communion; Rome was where she now is; and the Protestants were the Eutychians.”

In the same year he read Dr. Wiseman's article on the Anglican Claims in the *Dublin Review* for August, which compared the Anglicans with the Donatists; but Newman did not see the cogency of this; the Donatists had made a schism in their own African Church, it was not a case of one Church against another. But the sting of the article was in its tail. Dr. Wiseman quoted from St. Augustine, who wrote against these schismatics; and one of the extracts contained the triumphant judgment that, however vigorously heretics and schismatics may call themselves Catholic, the voice of the universal world, given without bias, is emphatically against them. “*Securus judicat orbis terrarum!*” The words were shown to Newman by a friend, and struck him with new and sudden force.

“What a light was hereby thrown upon every controversy in the Church! Not that, for the moment, the multitude may not falter in their judgment,—not that, in the Arian hurricane, sees more than can be remembered did not bend before its fury, and fall off from St. Athanasius,—not that the crowd of Oriental Bishops did not need to be sustained during the contest by the voice and the eye of St. Leo; but that the deliberate judgment, in which the whole Church at length rests and acquiesces, is an infallible prescription and a final sentence against such portions of it as protest and secede. Who can account for the impressions which are made on him? For a mere sentence, the

words of St. Augustine struck me with a power which I never had felt from any words before. To take a familiar instance, they were like the 'Turn again, Whittington' of the chime; or, to take a more serious one, they were like the 'Tolle, lege,—Tolle, lege,' of the child, which converted St. Augustine himself. 'Securus judicat orbis terrarum!' By those great words of the ancient Father, interpreting and summing up the long and varied course of ecclesiastical history, the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverised."

I must quote again, this time from an article by H. W. Wilberforce, in the *Dublin Review* for April 1869:—

"It was in the beginning of October 1839 that he made the astounding confidence, mentioning the two subjects which had inspired the doubt—the position of St. Leo in the Monophysite controversy, and the principle *securus judicat orbis terrarum* in that of the Donatists. He added that he felt confident that when he returned to his rooms, and was able fully and calmly to consider the whole matter, he should see his way completely out of the difficulty. But he said, 'I cannot conceal from myself that, for the first time since I began the study of theology, a vista has been opened before me, to the end of which I do not see.' He was walking in the New Forest, and he borrowed the form of his expression from the surrounding scenery. His companion, upon whom such a fear came like a thunder-stroke, expressed his hope that Mr. Newman might die rather than take such a step. He replied, with deep earnestness, that he had thought, if ever the time should come when he was in serious danger, of asking his friends to pray that, if it was not indeed the will of God, he might be taken away before he did it."

The vehemence of such language is a little astonishing at first, for, thanks in great measure to Newman himself, we have now learned to know Rome a little better, and we find that it smells far less of Tophet than Protestantism had taught us to believe. But the date of this conversation is 1839. Less than sixty years before, London had been in the hands of the "No Popery" rioters, headed by the madman Gordon. Only ten years before, the Duke of Wellington had fought a duel with Lord Winchelsea to

repel the intolerable accusation of harbouring a friendly feeling for Popery. Only ten years before had Catholics gained the elementary rights of citizenship, and that in the face of the fiercest opposition. The spirit of the age is manifested in such facts as these; and so the strong feeling shown in the quotation need not astonish any one. Newman's alarm did not lead him to immediate action. He became calm again. It was one thing to doubt; it was another to be convinced. There was too much in Rome for him to swallow yet; and in so great a matter, he refused to be ruled by imagination. Reason must be the only counsellor.

“Meanwhile, so far as this was certain,—I had seen the shadow of a hand upon the wall. It was clear that I had a good deal to learn on the question of the Churches, and that perhaps some new light was coming upon me. He who has seen a ghost, cannot be as if he had never seen it. The heavens had opened and closed again. The thought for the moment had been, ‘The Church of Rome will be found right after all’; and then it had vanished. My old convictions remained as before.”

Littlemore, not quite three miles from Oxford, was part of the parish of St. Mary's. There Newman had built a church, and to this he began to pay more attention, leaving the work at St. Mary's itself more and more to his curate. He wished, indeed, to give up St. Mary's and to live entirely at Littlemore. With this object he bought ground there, upon which he designed to build a monastic house. His position in Oxford was impossible. His influence over the young men was enormous. They carried admiration to the extent, even, of imitating his ways. He was the oracle from whom they sought counsel in all religious and ecclesiastical doubts—he, whose confidence in his own, nay, in the whole Anglican position, had received a staggering blow. They

came to him to learn how the Apostolical principles of the new school could be reconciled with the English Prayer Book. The Anglican formularies presented little difficulty. They certainly were Catholic enough in spirit; but the Thirty-nine Articles were a rock of offence.

“It was urged that here was a positive Note *against* Anglicanism: Anglicanism claimed to hold that the Church of England was nothing else than a continuation in this country (as the Church of Rome might be in France or Spain) of that one Church of which in old times Athanasius and Augustine were members. But, if so, the doctrine must be the same; the doctrine of the Old Church must live and speak in Anglican formularies, in the Thirty-nine Articles. Did it? Yes, it did; that is what I maintained; it did in substance, in a true sense. Man had done his worst to disfigure, to mutilate the old Catholic Truth; but there it was, in spite of them, in the Articles still. It was there—but this must be shown. It was a matter of life or death to us to show it.”

In order to show it, Newman wrote his Tract 90; and that portentous document appeared in February 1841. The storm that it raised was terrific. That the English Church might show some disinclination to accept his interpretation of the Articles was no more than Newman expected; he certainly did not anticipate the violent repudiation of Catholic, and equally violent affirmation of Protestant principles that the Tract called forth from every part of the country. It had been plain from the first, that the English Church as a whole would have nothing to do with the Catholic doctrines of the Oxford Party; it was now plain that Protestantism, and nothing else, would be tolerated. Newman's action all through was most proper. He was ready—morbidly anxious, one might almost say—to show obedience to his bishop. The tract was not withdrawn, but it was the last of that remarkable series. He

withdrew from Oxford to Littlemore, and went on with his translation of St. Athanasius.

After all, the hostile reception of Tract 90 was no more than it deserved. It is, I think, the least admirable and least characteristic of all Newman's productions. It is a laboured piece of "begging the question"; and if it proves anything, it proves that the Thirty-nine Articles cannot and will not bear a Catholic interpretation. Its fumbling logomachies, different entirely from Newman's excellent precision in definition, created that suspicion of dishonesty which rested on him so long, and which, for some people, is not even yet removed.

And now, to use his own phrase, came three blows that broke him. The first was delivered by St. Athanasius. The ghost had come again! It had come in his study of the Monophysites; it rose like a minatory shadow out of St. Augustine's magnificent sentence against the Donatists; now it hovered over every page of Arian history. The pure Arians were the Protestants; the semi-Arians were his own party, the Church of the *Via Media*; and Rome was—Rome, as ever! While he was still quivering under this blow, the second fell, in the shape of an Episcopal chorus denouncing Tract 90. It was not only the rank and file of the Church that fell foul of this unfortunate production; from almost every see came official condemnation. This was almost enough in itself. A Church that unanimously repudiated Catholic principles was not the Church in which Newman could feel at peace. And upon all this came the third blow—the affair of the Jerusalem bishopric. An arrangement between England and Prussia was made, by which an English archbishop should consecrate a bishop to minister to the Protestants in Palestine—Protestants, some of them, of dubious baptism and no Confirmation. This

scheme struck Newman in two places. In the first place, it shattered the "Branch Theory" of the Church. If the Anglican Church were the branch of the Church Catholic in England, it clearly had no right to create a new congregation within the dominions of the Greek Church. As Newman put it, if England might be in Palestine, Rome might be in England. And then, at the very time that the Bishops were demolishing Newman for trying to show that the official beliefs of Anglicanism contained nothing in antagonism to the teaching of St. Augustine and St. Athanasius, those same Bishops were advocating a scheme for admitting to full communion with the Establishment, and with no renunciation of error, Christians who would have been anathematised by every Saint of the Church. That ended it. From this time (1841) he was on his Anglican death-bed, but was an unconscionable time a-dying.

The years from 1841 to 1845 were the bitterest of his life. The Church of his birth and baptism, that he had longed to see acknowledged as the representative in England of the ancient Catholic Church, had thrust him out, and had taken to flirt with heresy. But he could not yet see his way to Rome. He held on and waited as if for a sign from heaven. Meanwhile paragraphs about what Mr. Newman might be doing at Littlemore began to enliven the newspapers. He was building a monastery with real cells; he was decoying impressionable young men there; nay, he was actually a Romanist, but by special dispensation was allowed to pass himself off as an Anglican, in order to lure others into the foul bog of Popery. He was maligned for going near Rome, and maligned for not going there. He was believed to have got there at last, and maligned for that. He did nothing at all, and that in itself was most suspicious. While this storm of obloquy crashed round him, he, in his inmost heart, was

suffering very deeply. He knew that he had to go. He knew, as well, that going meant the sacrifice of prospects, of the labour of years, of the trust of friends. For a mind whose scrupulousness was delicate to the verge of the fantastic, the idea of such a change was bitterly distressing. He was not a private individual. He had been the virtual leader of a party. Thousands of eyes were fixed on him, ready to act as he acted. Thus he writes to his sister in a letter dated November 24th, 1844:—

“I have gone through a great deal of pain, and have been very much cut up. The one predominant distress upon me has been this unsettlement of mind I am causing. This is a thing that has haunted me day by day. And for days I had a literal pain in and about my heart, which I suppose at any moment I could bring on again. . . . Besides the pain of unsettling people, of course I feel the loss I am undergoing in the good opinion of my friends and well-wishers, though I can't tell how much I feel this. It is the shock, surprise, terror, forlornness, disgust, scepticism to which I am giving rise; the differences of opinion, division of families—all this it is that makes my heart ache.”

In the next year (March 13th) his sister writes:—

“It is like hearing that some dear friend must die. . . . Oh, dear John, can you have thought long enough before deciding on a step which, with its probable effects, must plunge so many in confusion and dismay?”

To this he replies:—

“If I went by what I wished, I should complete my seven years of waiting. Surely, more than this, or as much, cannot be expected of me—cannot be right in me to give at my age. How life is going! I see men dying who were boys, almost children, when I was born. Pass a very few years, and I am an old man. What means of judging can I have more than I have? What maturity of mind am I to expect? . . . At my time of life men love ease. I love ease myself. I am giving up a maintenance involving no duties, and adequate to all my wants. . . . I am making a large income by my sermons. I am, to

say the very least, risking this ; the chance is that my sermons will have no further sale at all. I have a good name with many ; I am deliberately sacrificing it. I have a bad name with more. I am fulfilling all their worst wishes, and giving them their most coveted triumph. I am distressing all I love, unsettling all I have instructed or aided. I am going to those whom I do not know, and of whom I expect very little. I am making myself an outcast, and that at my age. Oh, what can it be but a stern necessity which causes this ? Pity me ; . . . what have I done thus to be deserted, thus to be left to take a wrong course, if it is wrong ?”

From his sister’s answer we may extract a few words :—

“Indeed, I do pity you, for I know you are just the person to feel the force of the sacrifices you are making more than most, without the excitement which carries most persons through such changes ; and it needs no assurance from you for me to be sure that you do it simply because you think it right. . . . This is my hope and my consolation.”

During these months he began to illustrate in a volume his theory of Doctrinal Evolution, and that ended the matter. His last doubt had fled ; and the volume stands still unfinished. Why, one can point almost to the very line where the last scale fell from his eyes. Read the *Development of Christian Doctrine*. It is laboured, even hazy, at the start. It is not even interesting. He is feeling his way. Presently his touch gets surer ; and the magnificent sixth chapter, which sweeps the horizon of the first centuries and marks it out with beacon-points of proof—this chapter shows the coming of certain conviction ; and at the beginning of Chapter XI., we read between the lines that his conversion is complete. The book could not be published by any but a Catholic ; and it appeared just after his reception into that Church whose appearance from afar on the path whereon he was travelling had filled him with such pain and dismay. On October 8th, 1845, he wrote to his sister :—

"I must tell you what will pain you greatly, but I will make it as short as you would wish me to do.

"This night Father Dominic, the Passionist, sleeps here. He does not know of my intention, but I shall ask him to receive me into what I believe to be the One Fold of the Redeemer.

"This will not go till all is over."

And so, in the autumn of 1845, the Roman Church received from her English sister this richest of gifts, one whose mere life was to give Rome a place in England's thoughts that a whole library of controversy could not give; one whose name, we may say, sounds better with those great ones, Athanasius and Augustine, Basil and Chrysostom, Gregory and Leo, than with any of the heroes of Protestantism.

He had found peace and security; but he had to pay the price. He was long past the middle of a man's life, and he had to begin a sort of new existence; he was a stranger among strangers. He was called to Oscott by Dr. Wiseman, and on February 23rd, 1846, he bade a final farewell to Oxford, that dearly loved city of which he was almost a votary. In the autumn of the same year he went to Rome, where his studies were crowned by ordination to the priesthood. The character of St. Philip Neri appealed strongly to him; so, too, did the work of the Congregation of the Oratory, founded by that most pleasant and human of saints; and Newman felt that he could not serve the Church better than by establishing a branch of this Order in England. He came home at the end of 1847 and settled in Birmingham, where, in Alcester Street, the Oratory was first established. The mission and school work carried on there was made possible by the material self-denial of the Fathers; but this parochial side of Catholic labour was never the proper work of the Oratorians, and,

when it was possible, other hands relieved them of it, and the Fathers went to Edgbaston, henceforth their home. A branch was established in London, in King William Street, Strand, but removed to Brompton after becoming an independent house under Father Faber. The new church here has made Protestant London quite familiar with the interior of a Catholic place of worship; for the noble basilica is now firmly established in the metropolitan mind as a place to be "done" during the course of a visit to the adjacent museums. The thousands who wept at Mr. Toole's Caleb Plummer and laughed at his Paul Pry, in the theatre bearing his name, probably did not know that they were seated in the original home of the London Oratorians; and now, final absorption into Charing Cross Hospital has ended the varied career of that building. Newman remained at the head of the Birmingham Oratory; but, as Dr. Ullathorne reminded us, he was active in service for the Church, and not occupied with his own thoughts and feelings. In 1849, when the cholera had seized upon Bilston, the priests in that town had more work to do than they could perform. Dr. Ullathorne designed to send there two additional priests, and asked Newman to lend him two of the Fathers to take the parochial duties of these two men. Instead of doing this, Newman, accompanied by his dear friend Ambrose St. John, went himself to the stricken town and laboured there till the worst was over.

Newman's great gifts and the nature of his former work marked him out as one specially fitted to influence, by tongue and pen, people of the better classes, or perhaps one should rather say, people of good sense and culture. Thus, neither his preaching nor his writing can be called "popular in the ordinary sense. In 1848, he published anonymously a novel called *Loss and Gain*, the story of a conversion very

different from his own. Novel, in the ordinary sense, it is not. Its atmosphere, its satire, and its delicate prose will delight the cultivated reader; but I fear it will fail to transport the ordinary consumer of fiction. It is the story of a conversion, but of an individual conversion; and the non-Catholic can read it without any alteration in the plane of his inclination to the Roman Church. In 1850 Newman came to London and delivered in the old place in King William Street a series of lectures entitled, "Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching considered." Nominally addressed to Anglicans of the Oxford movement, these lectures are really of universal intention. They are an indictment of the Establishment, a demonstration of the futility of the Movement, and a very persuasive—I will not say convincing—explanation of many things in the Roman system which offend the Anglican mind. It was in these lectures that Newman first exhibited in full his wonderful power of irony; and, taking them all round, they form one of his most attractive contributions to literature. But whatever good these lectures may have done in the way of making Rome better known to Englishmen, was quite undone by events at the end of the same year, 1850. Dr. Wiseman was called to Rome and made Cardinal. While he was there, the question was raised of reviving a Catholic Hierarchy in England, which till this time had been governed by Vicars Apostolic. After discussion by Propaganda, the establishment was authorised by a Brief dated September 29th, and Wiseman was named Archbishop of Westminster. But the Cardinal allowed his emotions to get the better of his judgment, and the change, which was one of words rather than things, was announced to English Catholics with a flourish of trumpets, in a pastoral "given from without the Flaminian Gate of Rome." The

magnificent assumption of this pastoral gave great offence to the English people, and a violent anti-Catholic tempest swept through the land. "Papal Aggression" was the cry. Serious disturbances took place, and the land was lit with bonfires wherein blazed the effigies of Wiseman and of Pius IX. himself. The new Archbishop tried to quiet the agitation with his "Appeal to the English People"; and in the summer of 1851 Newman came forward and delivered a series of lectures on the "Present Position of Catholics in England." I have spoken of these lectures in another volume, and need say no more here. One effect they produced was extremely unpleasant. The anti-Catholic heat brought forth the usual crop of converted Papists, reclaimed monks, and escaped nuns. They made hay while the sun shone. One of these was an Italian, Dr. Achilli, a creature of the Maria Monk order. Newman demolished him in one of the lectures, and an action for criminal libel was the result. Lord Campbell in his charge, and the British jury in its verdict, were carried away by the current of contemporary feeling, and the ex-Dominican won the day. Newman was held not to have justified his main accusations, and was fined £100. The costs of the action, amounting to over £12,000, were paid by public subscription. But out of this evil good came. Dr. Achilli was utterly extinguished; and the manifest unfairness of the charge and verdict did much to make sober Protestants see whither their feelings were leading them.

In 1854 Newman went to Ireland as first Rector of the Catholic University in Dublin. This institution was doomed to failure. The question of a Catholic University is a delicate one; it divides Cabinets even to this day; and the difficulty is certainly not solved by the establishment of a private university whose degrees receive no official recogni-

tion. Then the Irish bishops, who fathered the new institution, found that Newman's idea of what makes a liberal education differed fundamentally from theirs. Catholic education, they said in effect, must aim at making a Catholic. No, replies Newman, it must aim at making a man. Add to these difficulties Newman's lack of the qualities that make a good organiser and a strong leader, and we need inquire no further into the causes of the failure. He returned to Birmingham in 1858; but his Irish years had not been wasted. His Rectorship brought forth the two volumes of addresses described fully in my first Introduction, and those delightful sketches of University history that form the matter of the companion volume to this. In Ireland, too, he finished *Callista, a Tale of the Third Century*. This was commenced in 1848; but he tells us that he gave up writing it from "sheer inability to devise personages and incidents." It is a very beautiful book, not to be missed by any who care for the delicacies of literature; but its merits as fiction will hardly alone suffice to give it any length of life.

In 1858 Newman returned to Edgbaston, and in the following year established the School there. This highly valuable part of his life's work is perhaps the least generally known outside Catholic circles. The pupils were drawn from the better classes, and the education was indeed liberal in the best sense of the word. The fulness and freedom of the boys' amusements, especially on Sundays, caused the respectabilities of the district some few pangs at first; but common-sense and convention usually greet each other with mutual distrust, especially if religious prepossessions come into the argument. But the world outside the Birmingham district heard little of Newman till the year 1864, when Charles Kingsley's

charge against him of teaching the duty of systematic falsehood, gave him a chance of taking the world into his confidence. Of that controversy, and its unique product, the *Apologia*, I have spoken at length in a former volume, and nothing more need be said here. This ingenuous publication, so unimpeachably sincere, so redolent of complete faith in an age of doubt, drew the eyes of all men towards the recluse of Birmingham; and the popular mind canonised him and never faltered in its reverence.

Other events tended to keep his name before the world. With the deplorable statesmanship and illiberal policy of Pio Nono's later years Newman must have found himself often at variance. He was not a strong leader of men; but in the less concrete art of statesmanship he had, I believe, rare gifts that were largely frustrated by his inveterate detachment from the world. Academic statesmanship is not everything; perhaps it is not even very much; but the peculiarly delicate position of Papal affairs in the political world demanded for its maintenance or modification something less truculently practical than the policy which came to be adopted; and it is possible that, had Pius IX. been guided by a Cardinal Newman instead of a Cardinal Antonelli, the position of the Pope in Rome would not be the chronic anomaly that it is at present. Newman's opinions were probably those of which Manzoni was the most illustrious Italian representative, opinions that reconciled a fervent Catholicism with sincere aspirations for a united Italy. It is not surprising, therefore, that he was viewed with suspicion and dislike by those violent English Catholics who were more Papal than the Papalini themselves.

In other matters, too, Newman found himself out of agreement with Rome. There can be no doubt that he fully accepted the doctrine of Papal Infallibility; in fact,

his works can be made to produce testimony to a belief in this dogma long before its definition in 1870. His opposition to the definition was purely political. There seemed no real necessity for making *de fide* a doctrine that was already tacitly accepted by most Catholics, and was bound to be misunderstood by non-Catholics, a doctrine that would prove a stumbling-block to many Anglicans who seemed to be stepping Romeward, that would retard very seriously the advance which was being made towards a better understanding and larger toleration of Catholicism, by those who had no inclination to accept its teaching. Newman's belief was that the definition was wholly unnecessary. "When," he writes to Archbishop Ullathorne, "when has a definition *de fide* been a luxury of devotion, and not a stern, painful necessity? Why should an aggressive, insolent faction be allowed to make the 'heart of the just sad, whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful'? Why cannot we be let alone, when we have pursued peace and thought no evil? . . . If it is God's will that the Pope's infallibility is defined, then is it God's will to throw back the times and moments of that triumph which He has destined for His Kingdom; and I shall feel I have but to bow my head to His adorable, inscrutable providence." This letter, purely a private one, was by some unexplained breach of confidence printed in the *Standard*, and naturally caused much annoyance to both sides. But the views of the "aggressive and insolent faction" triumphed at Rome. The doctrine was defined. Manning was made cardinal, and Newman remained out of favour in high places. It was Newman, however, that was called for the defence when Mr. Gladstone, smarting under a defeat on the Irish University question, attacked the Vatican decrees in a pamphlet whose main contention

was that Catholics could not be trustworthy subjects of the State. Newman's reply was "A Letter to the Duke of Norfolk," now printed in the second volume of the *Difficulties of Anglicans*. It is an acute and closely reasoned composition, showing that, even in his seventy-fourth year, Newman was still a master of controversy and of the English tongue. No finer or clearer statement of what Papal Infallibility means, and what it does not mean, can be found than this pamphlet with its postscript, the last, practically, of a long line of wonderful compositions, all designed for the service of God and the Truth, as Newman understood them. One highly important work, his *Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*, published in 1870, has been barely mentioned in this Introduction, and not at all in that to the volume of *University Sketches*. The subject is one of equal importance and difficulty. Newman's aim is of course religious; but I feel quite sure that some advance in our knowledge of the working of the mind will be made along the line that he indicates in this volume. We gain conviction, he argues, not from paper logic, but from an infinite multitude of converging probabilities. In pure mathematics, a circle can be regarded as a polygon with an infinite number of sides; and probability shades into truth, just as a many-sided figure becomes a perfect circle. The conversion of probability into certitude is made by an Illative sense.

Nowadays we are taught that everything we should believe must be shredded out, and weighed and measured by the reason. This sounds convincing; but it is not in this way of patient doubt and analysis that we know what we know. I cannot resist quoting from a letter written nearly a hundred years before Newman's volume, by Coleridge, most potential and most baffled of all philosophers:—

“Should children be permitted to read romances, and relations of giants and magicians and genii? I know all that has been said against it; but I have formed my faith in the affirmative. I know no other way of giving the mind a love of the great and the whole. Those who have been led on to the same truths step by step, through the constant testimony of their senses, seem to me to want a sense that I possess. They contemplate nothing but *parts*, and all *parts* are necessarily little. And the universe to them is but a mass of *little things*. It is true that the mind *may* become credulous and prone to superstition by the former method; but are not the experimentalists credulous even to madness in believing any absurdity, rather than believe the grandest truths, if they have not the testimony of their own senses in their favour? I have known some who have been *rationaly* educated, it is styled. They were marked by a microscopic acuteness, but when they looked at great things, all became a blank and they saw nothing, and denied (very illogically) that anything could be seen, and uniformly put the negation of a power for the possession of a power, and called the want of imagination judgment, and the never being moved to rapture philosophy.”

And now at the end of a long and difficult life, late-coming honours were given him. Trinity, the college of his undergraduate days, made him Honorary Fellow; and in 1878 he revisited Oxford, in which he had not set foot since his sad departure almost exactly thirty-two years before. The same year saw the close of Pio Nono's stormy career, and the accession to St. Peter's throne of a delicate and far-seeing politician. Some day men will recognise in Leo XIII. one of the greatest statesmen of our time. Not easy is it peacefully to divide with other rulers the allegiance of millions of subjects, not easy to uphold at the Vatican the sovereign dignity of many centuries while another reigns at the Quirinal. And Leo has done these things. He has walked with safety on a difficult path, where a false step would have brought disaster to the Church. He has the saving gift of humour, and through

that lucid medium he sees the Church and the World. At his accession the sullen intransigence of the dead Pontiff gave place to a policy of reconciliation wherever that was possible. The counsellors of moderation, despised of Pius, now came into favour ; and one of Leo's earliest acts was to raise Newman to the purple. There is no wonder that he hesitated to accept this dignity. He was nearly eighty ; his life had been strangely simple and retired ; and thus to be ennobled was a change almost too great to be borne. But every allowance was made. He was allowed to live at the Oratory—a rare mark of favour, for exemption from residence at Rome is, as a rule, granted only to cardinals who are also diocesans. Not for himself only, but for the sake of those moderate English Catholics whose leader he had been, Newman accepted the honour ; and in April 1879 he set out for Rome. On May 12th he was formally created Cardinal Deacon of the Holy Roman Church, with the title of San Giorgio in Velabro.

Slowly back to his England, back to his children of St. Philip, came the old man, there amongst them to wait for the end which could not now be far off. His bodily faculties began to fail, but his powers of mind remained till the end. He was almost blind, and his hand could scarcely hold a pen. Those who saw him at the Brompton Oratory not long before his death, heard that wonderful voice, which had thrilled religious England for so many years, sounding now like an echo from beyond the tomb. In August 1890 he was attacked by pneumonia, and, after little more than a day's illness, died on the evening of Monday, August 11th. Magnificent in simplicity had been the life of this man, and such was his earthly end ; after lying in state, as befitted a Prince of the Church, he was buried in the little graveyard of the Oratorians at Rednal, on August 19th.

One of the pressing needs of English literature is a fitting biography of Cardinal Newman; at least we ought to have the letters of his Catholic life, for at present we stop dead at 1845. Whoever is bold enough to attempt a biography must have rare sympathy. He must be able to follow and understand Newman's movements in both Churches; he must be able, as well, to detach himself from all religious or anti-religious prepossessions, and watch his subject phenomenally. But, above all, he must be sympathetic. Newman has been lauded and denounced both as an Anglican and as a Catholic; he has been revered as a saint, and treated as a charlatan to be exposed. No one seems able to take a view of him, steadily and calmly, as a whole. Nothing for sure is gained by the method of Kingsley and Huxley, by reasoning, that is, of this sort: Dr. Newman professes to believe such and such; I am utterly unable to believe these things; I am convinced no honest man can; so Dr. Newman is a drivelling sophist, nay, more, a liar and a deluder of men. Huxley's references to Newman reveal gross ignorance of what the Cardinal really meant and said, ignorance that almost appears deliberate. Some very sincere men find it impossible to believe in the sincerity of those who disagree with them.

I do not think, either, that we get to the heart of Newman's mystery by assuming that he was essentially sceptical, and that he chose, for some unexplained reason, to drug his intellect, to narcotise himself into a superstitious belief. The testimony of Newman's forty volumes is emphatically against any such assumption. It is not lip-service that is written there; it is full and fervent faith, faith that cannot be explained or sneered away. Keeness of vision, sanity of thought, these, also, are legibly inscribed on every page

that Newman wrote; and yet he avows his belief in the saintly legends with an emphasis that takes one's breath away.

“For myself, lest I appear in any way to be shrinking from a determinate judgment on the claims of some of those miracles and relics which Protestants are so startled at, and to be hiding particular questions in what is vague and general, I will avow distinctly that, putting out of the question the hypothesis of unknown laws of nature (that is, of the professed miracle being not miraculous), I think it impossible to withstand the evidence which is brought for the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius at Naples, and for the motion of the eyes of the pictures of the Madonna in the Roman States. I see no reason to doubt the material of the Lombard crown at Monza; and I do not see why the Holy Coat at Trèves may not have been what it professes to be. I firmly believe the portions of the True Cross are at Rome and elsewhere, that the Crib of Bethlehem is at Rome, and the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul also. I believe that at Rome, too, lies St. Stephen, that St. Matthew lies at Salerno, and St. Andrew at Amalfi. I firmly believe that the relics of the saints are doing innumerable miracles and graces daily, and that it needs only for a Catholic to show devotion to any saint in order to receive special benefits from his intercession. I firmly believe that saints in their lifetime have before now raised the dead to life, crossed the sea without vessels, multiplied grain and bread, cured incurable diseases, and superseded the operation of the laws of the universe in a multitude of ways. Many men, when they hear an educated man so speak, will at once impute the avowal to insanity, or to an idiosyncrasy, or to imbecility of mind, or to decrepitude of powers, or to fanaticism, or to hypocrisy. They have a right to say so, if they will; and we have a right to ask them why they do not say it of those who bow down before the Mystery of mysteries, the Divine Incarnation. If they do not believe this, they are not yet Protestants; if they do, let them grant that He who has done the greater may do the less.”

The last few lines are controversial, addressed to Protestants. They are not in Blougram's vein. He does not say, “I refuse to give up St. Januarius, because I don't see where to draw the line, because

“First cut the Liquefaction, what comes last
But Fichte’s clever cut at God Himself?”

He merely says, “I believe all this; if you who are Protestants do not, then it is because you are afraid of inferences from the beliefs that you do avow.” And, after all, those who are able sincerely to believe that Elijah multiplied the widow’s oil and meal, that he raised her son from the dead, that Elisha multiplied oil and raised a child from the dead, that he made iron to swim, that his bones restored to life a dead man, that the shadow of St. Peter healed the sick, that he restored Tabitha to life, that St. Paul was able to make alive again dead Eutyches, whose body was shattered by a fall from three storeys—those, I say, who can believe all this, should think long and seriously before they cast a stone at Newman for the beliefs that he confessed with such startling frankness. His faith was not a compromise. He believed in an Omnipotent God, and shrank from no deductions. He did not say, “Yes, I believe God omnipotent, but here and here I limit His power.” He did not believe in an Omnipotence that was not omnipotent. He believed fully; and what at first sight may strike the reader as puerilities, are only part of the price that has to be paid for perfect faith. Faith such as this stands up like a great rock out of the sea of doubt and compromise. Unlovely sea-wrack may cling about its base; but its head darts through the clouds and beholds the face of the sun. Faith, perfect even when it seems grossly disfigured—that is his secret. Not to all of us is given grace to believe as he believed; not for all of us is it possible to accept the creed that he accepted; but all can acknowledge with fitting reverence the majestic singleness of heart, the eagerness in God’s

service, the sacrifice of everything for truth, the almost miraculous simplicity of faith, that make up the tale of his life. He was not faultless, for he was a man; but he is the truest saint that Christianity of our day has to offer us.¹ "He comes," to quote a verse of his—

"He comes by grace of his address,
By the sweet music of his face,
And his low tones of tenderness,
To melt a noble, stubborn race."

He is an anachronism, this man with the head of a Cæsar, the pen and tongue of a Cicero, and the heart and fervour of a St. Philip Neri; he belongs to the nineteenth century, he learns what the nineteenth century has to teach, yet he seems to belong in spirit to the age of St. Athanasius or St. Augustine. Though fired with his faith, he was no ecstatic visionary. He was a gentleman of the widest culture, perhaps the keenest intellect of his time: yet in an age of doubt he stands as a symbol of faith; in an

¹ A friend who saw the proofs objects that both this and the former introduction go too far in the way of eulogy. Perhaps he is not altogether wrong, but he mistakes my intention, which is to make Newman as attractive as possible to those readers who are repelled by his creed and the subject-matter of his work. A person pledged to definite anti-Roman views would naturally write with less enthusiasm than I, who regard his ways and works with all the tolerance of a general reader unlearned in matters of theology. Of course one could write as easily against Newman as against Dean Stanley or Mr. Spencer or Mr. Spurgeon; but, unless one is maintaining a certain religious position, there seems no need to do so. After all, the logic of his life was perfect. What he believed to be the truth, that he followed, simply and consistently; and if it led him to Rome instead of to the Unknowable, I decline to admit that he is therefore disentitled to our respect.

age of negation he astonishes by the fervour of his affirmations ; in an age of materialism he is the type of belief in the unseen ; in an age of religious anarchy he is the embodiment of submission to authority.

GEORGE SAMPSON.

NOTE ON THE TEXT.

I HAVE tried to make a selection from Newman's essays that will be interesting to the general reader, and representative of the author's range of subjects. Historical essays receive perhaps more than their due share of space ; but as they are likely to interest the larger number of readers, this over representation cannot be called improper in a popular volume.

The choice of text offered some difficulty. When Newman in his later life published a collected edition of his works, he revised his Anglican writings very considerably, and made changes that were not altogether due to a desire for literary excellence. Moreover, he deprecated any reprint of these Anglican essays which did not give as well his Catholic reflections thereon. But, after all, it is well to remember that Newman did not always think as a Catholic ; and so the essays written during his maturest Anglican years seem worth reprinting in their original form, not only for their own sake, but as expressions of his thought at a highly interesting period of his life. The essays in this volume, then, are "mixed." The first three were written several years before he became a Catholic ; the fourth in the year after his conversion ; the Benedictine sketches during his mature Catholic life. Each essay is an exact reprint of the first edition, and, of course, for those who desire to make comparison, the revised text is readily available in the collected edition.

G. S.

SELECT ESSAYS OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

THE REFORMATION OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.¹

PERHAPS the greatest of the wants under which our religious literature labours at this day is that of an ecclesiastical history. It is inconvenient enough to have no good commentary on Scripture, and so little of systematic theology; but the Creed tells us the principal points of doctrine, and Scripture is to the pious mind, in some sense, its own interpreter. But the providences of God towards His Church during eighteen centuries, though contained in outline in prophecy, are consigned to no formula or document clear enough to convey its own meaning, and minute enough to impress its peculiarities upon the private Christian. Not even the wildest advocate for the right of private judgment ever professed to apprehend past facts, as he might think he discovered revealed doctrines, without the assistance of books or teachers. Rather such a one will commonly be found to depreciate, instead of pretending to historical knowledge: he will apply the Caliph Omar's argument to the events of 1800 years, and say that except for the first and last three centuries they are not to be studied at all, as being little or nothing better than the times of predicted evil. He shuts up God's dealings

¹ From the *British Critic* of April 1841. A review of *The Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh*, by J. W. Bowden, one of Newman's oldest friends.

with His Church under a formula, and is contented with symbols which neither he nor any one else can put into plain English.

It is difficult justly to estimate the injury done to our whole view of Gospel truth by our ignorance of ecclesiastical history. Every department of divinity acts upon the rest, and if one is neglected the others suffer. Our view of doctrine affects our view of history, and our view of history our view of doctrine; and our view of doctrine the sense we put upon Scripture; and our interpretation of Scripture our ethics, and our ethics our interpretation of Scripture. And, moreover, the history of the past ends in the present; and the present is our scene of trial; and to behave ourselves towards its various phenomena duly and religiously, we must understand them; and to understand them, we must have recourse to those past events which led to them. Thus the present is a text, and the past its interpretation. To a child there is no difference between one fact and another in the religious world. He does not understand their mutual relations or their respective bearings. He has, when an infant in arms, learned to classify and dispose of objects of sense; he knows that the church spire is not so near him as his nose or his hand, and that leaves are parts of the tree, and not of the sky or the earth, with which they are conterminous. But he cannot learn without the assistance of others the meaning of moral facts; and, as things are, he commonly grows up, and lives and dies as ignorant of those of an ecclesiastical character as he was when he first had the faculty of thought. "What is the difference between a Methodist and a Roman Catholic?" and "Why are we not all Quakers?" are the questions which a thoughtful child of five years old may ask; and it is not at all clear whether he is likely to have taken any real steps towards the solution of them by the time he is fifty. This of course is witnessed in the case of political and social facts quite as much as in ecclesiastical. What a different meaning, for instance, has the so-called "Catholic Relief Bill," or the Reform Bill, to men of twenty and of thirty! How differently has the character of the Duke of Wellington come out to the present generation since the publication of his despatches! How differently appear our present relations with Russia to those who

know and those who are ignorant of the history of the last century ! Men enter into life, and take what they find there, and put their own interpretation upon it, if their imaginations are not preoccupied with the one true historical comment. This is why there is such difficulty in rousing the public mind to understand the importance of certain measures, proposed or resisted: to the public they are facts without meaning. What virtue is there in a name to those who are dead to it ? Why should not Brutus stir a spirit as soon as Cæsar ? It is the association which is every thing; but to those who know not the true history of that to which the name belongs, there are no associations with it, or wrong ones.

The case is the same as regards persons. Take a given orator and he shall make a speech, or author and he shall write a pamphlet, or preacher and he shall deliver a sermon; and then let it be considered how differently the speech, or the pamphlet, or the sermon in each case seems to persons who know him well and those who do not. Very different, for good and for bad : let him be a man of pomp and parade, or of smoothness and artifice, and strangers will be taken in, and admire the very words, turns of speech and gestures, which make those who know him only cry out, "How like so-and-so !" On the other hand, the deep feeling and reality of another sort of person go clean over the heads of those who do not know him, while friends are pierced by every word. Let the very same speech or sentiment come from two persons, and it has quite a different meaning, according to the speaker, and takes a different form in our minds. We always judge of what meets us by what we know already. There is no such thing in nature as a naked text without note or comment.

It is a curious fact that these remarks even apply to the case of personal appearance, as is sometimes proved by the test of portraits. Let a likeness, taken twenty years ago, be put before two persons, one of whom knew the subject of it at the time and the other did not, and the latter perhaps will think it unsuccessful and the former successful. We colour our ocular vision with the hues of the imagination : as reason is said to deceive our eyes

in the phenomenon of the horizontal moon, so memory is a gloss upon them here. Our friend has grown fat, or his temples are higher, or his face is broader, or lines have come to view along his cheek or across his forehead, and yet in certain cases we shall be heard to say that such a one has not altered at all since the day we first knew him. To us his youth is stamped upon his maturity, and he lives in our eye, as well as in our mind, as when we first gave him our affection. We are surprised on going into the world to hear him called a middle-aged man.

In such a case, to be sure, we have an instance of an abuse of the important instrument which has been above insisted on. But we adduce it to prove the extent of the influence which the knowledge of the past has on the present;—that it may become excessive and out of place ; that we may become mere antiquarians and pedants ; that we may bury ourselves in the illusions of history when we should contemplate things as they are before us, is very certain: but the danger at this day rather is, lest, from total ignorance of history, we should be obliged to determine every action and every principle by the only test which will practically be left us, the test of visible expediency. And late ecclesiastical occurrences supply some melancholy instances in point. This will be the certain consequence of treating history as an old almanac, whatever persons of some station in the Church may say to the contrary.

And again, it must be recollected that men will form theories and write books on religious subjects, whether or not they have the facts which alone can enable them to do so justly. To assign causes, to draw out relations, is natural to man; and he will do it on a theory rather than not at all. A number of answers can be given to the question, What is the Church? We are far from saying that in so complicated a question *only* one, or perhaps that any *one*, is right and true; but whatever is right, whatever wrong, surely we must go to history for the information. If we are content to look round, catch up certain peculiarities which meet our eye, listen to what is said in Parliament or the newspapers, or in some fashionable chapel, and then proceed to form our theory, we shall probably approach about as near the truth as the

Oriental who defined the English as a nation who live on the sea and make pen-knives. This is a remark which applies in a measure even to writers of a deeper tone of thought. We are just now becoming rich in treatises on ecclesiastical politics and doctrine : let us take good care that our views do not get ahead of our knowledge.

We have now given some of the reasons why we are especially obliged to Mr. Bowden for a work like that which is now before us. No one can write without opinions : we are far from saying that Mr. Bowden has not his own, and that very decidedly ; but he has drawn out the facts of a most momentous and wonderful period of history with great distinctness and perspicuity, and we are sure that no one will rise from the perusal of his volumes without grateful feelings to their author for the information and instruction he has provided. We do not intend to make this article a panegyric on Mr. Bowden, but to convey to the reader by means of it some account of his subjects. Yet, before proceeding to business, it is but justice to him to say that he has given us at once a very learned and a very well arranged history. To have read the original sources diligently and to report them accurately is one great praise ; but a far more difficult task is the combination and adjustment of materials. To bring out the course of events so that a reader may go away with a definite impression upon his mind of what has passed through it is a very difficult art. We are not perhaps quite satisfied with Mr. Bowden's style ; but we eulogise his composition. He is a very neat and skilful artist, a clear and forcible narrator, makes a great many points, and every one of them tells.

But now let us proceed to his work itself. It is the history of the commencement of that great reformation of the Church in the middle ages, which Providence conducted through the instrumentality, partly divine, partly human, of the Papal monarchy. It is usual to call the times in which it occurred the dark ages, but properly speaking that title applies to the centuries which preceded it. No exaggeration is possible of the demoralised state into which the Christian world, and especially the Church of Rome, had fallen in the years that followed the

extinction of the Carlovingian line. The tenth century is even known among Protestants *par excellence* as the *saeculum obscurum*, and Baronius expresses its portentous corruption in the vivid remark that Christ was as if asleep in the vessel of the Church. "The infamies prevalent among the clergy of the time," says Mr. Bowden, "as denounced by Damiani and others, are to be alluded to, not detailed" (vol. i. p. 144). When Hildebrand was appointed to the monastery of St. Paul, he found the offices of devotion systematically neglected, the house of prayer defiled by the sheep and cattle which found their way in and out through its broken doors, and the monks, contrary to all monastic rule, attended in their refectory by women. The excuse for these irregularities was the destitution to which the holy house was reduced by the predatory bands of Campagna; but when the monastic bodies were rich, as was the case in Germany, matters were worse instead of better. Unworthy brethren of the conventual orders, Mr. Bowden tells us, incessantly beset the ears of princes and great people who had the presentation to abbeys and benefices, proffering sums so large in purchase that secular competitors were excluded. The world wondered, says a historian of the times, himself a monk, from what springs such rivers of wealth could flow; and understood not how the riches of Cræsus or Tantalus could be amassed by men who had taken on them the scandal of the Cross and the profession of poverty. In Lombardy, the Archbishop Guido in the eleventh century was said to have invariably demanded a price for the favour of admission into holy orders; his clergy were in their own way as deeply involved in the guilt of simony as himself, till their very flocks learned to treat them with open manifestations of contempt, reviled them in the house of God itself, and hooted them along the streets. When Hildebrand went as legate into France, he first brought to confession an archbishop who had contrived to bribe to silence the principal evidences against him of simony; and upon his deposition, no less than forty-five bishops and twenty-seven other dignitaries or governors of churches came forward to confess the guilty mode by which they had obtained their benefices, and retired from stations which they had no

valid claim to retain. Even two centuries earlier than this, when, as appears on the face of the facts, the corruption was not so general, a council of Paris had complained that many of the clergy were so occupied in the pursuit of gain and other worldly avocations that they suffered many infants to die without baptism. A council of Aix-la-Chapelle of the same date prohibits extortion and intemperance in bishops, and protests against their non-residence. A synod of Pavia a little later prohibits the clergy the practice of sumptuous banquets and the use of dogs and hawks. Hincmar judged it expedient to issue a decree against the pawning by the clergy of the vestments and the communion plate. In the times of St. Romuald, who died in 1027, the practice of emperors selling bishoprics, bishops their preferments, and laymen their benefices was so recognised and ordinary, that when the saint had spoken even to religious persons of simony as a sin, he seemed to them to inculcate overstrained and fanciful notions. Adelbert, Archbishop of Bremen, himself a man of pure life and austere practices in an age of general dissoluteness, conceived a plan, by means of the imperial influence which he enjoyed, of making Hamburg the seat of his power, and establishing a sort of papacy in the North. With this purpose in view he was tempted to grasp at every method of increasing his revenues, and disgraced his rule by a widespread system of corruption and plunder. Associating himself with a profligate favourite of the Emperor, he despoiled without shame the lands and revenues of the less powerful religious communities, and put up to sale every office, civil or ecclesiastical, which fell to his disposal. If such were the practices of men who were stricter than their brethren, what was to be expected of the multitude of ecclesiastics who were involved in sensuality, or at least in carnal indulgence and sloth? Mr. Bowden shall inform by a scene which took place during the minority of the Emperor Henry the Fourth. At the point at which we take up his narrative he is speaking of the bishops of Germany.

“Their rapacity exhibited itself in the shameless way in which they, as if in emulation of each other, extorted from the crown the grant of

lands, manors, farms, and forests, to the manifest diminution of the royal dignity; as well as in the unjust annexation of the property of religious communities, which were unable to resist them, to the territory of their sees. Nor in pride, or in the fierceness with which they resisted all real or imagined insults, inconsistent as such qualities are with the sacerdotal character, were the spiritual fathers of Germany a whit inferior to the imperious secular nobles with whom they associated. At the commencement of vespers before the king and court at Goslar, at the solemn season of Christmas 1062, a dispute arose between the servants of the Bishop of Hildesheim and those of the Abbot of Fulda, with regard to the position of the seats of their respective masters. The abbot, by ancient usage, was entitled to sit next to the metropolitan; but the bishop, indignant that any should take this place, within his own diocese, in preference to himself, had commanded his domestics to place the chairs accordingly. The dispute soon led to blows, and but for the interference of Otho of Bavaria would have terminated in bloodshed. This noble asserted the rights of the abbot, and the bishop was consequently foiled. He looked forward, however, to a renewal of the contest under more favourable auspices; and at the feast of Pentecost following, previously to the entrance of the king and the prelates into the church, he secreted behind the high altar Count Ecbert and some well-armed soldiers. As the contending prelates proceeded to their seats, the affray between the servants began again; when the count, suddenly springing from his ambush, rushed with his followers upon the astonished men of Fulda, and drove them with blows and menaces from the church. But they too had made preparations for a violent struggle, and had friends and arms at hand. In a body they rushed once more into the sacred building, and engaged their enemies with swords in the midst of the choir, confusedly mingled with the choristers. Fiercely was the combat waged: 'throughout the Church,' says Lambert of Aschaffenburg, resounded, instead of hymns and spiritual songs, the shouts of the combatants and the screams of the dying; ill-omened victims were slaughtered upon the altar of God; while through the building ran rivers of blood, poured forth, not by the legal religion of other days, but by the mutual cruelty of enemies.' The Bishop of Hildesheim, rushing to a pulpit or some other conspicuous position, exhorted his followers, according to the same writer, as with the sound of a trumpet, to persevere in the fray, and encouraged them by his authority, and by the promise of absolution, to disregard the sanctity of the place. The young monarch called in vain on his subjects to reverence his royal

dignity ; all ears were deaf to his vociferated commands and entreaties ; and at length, urged by those around him to consult his own safety, he escaped with difficulty from the thickening tumult, and made his way to his palace. The men of Fulda, by the efforts of Count Ecbert, were at length repulsed, and the doors of the church closed against them ; upon which, ranging themselves before the building, they prepared to assail their enemies again as soon as they should issue from it ; and there remained until the approach of night induced them to retire."—Vol. i. pp. 235, 237.

Miserable as are the above specimens of those truly "dark ages," yet they are decency itself compared with the atrocities which in the same era disgraced the see of Rome. At the close of the ninth century, Stephen VI. dragged the body of an obnoxious predecessor from the grave, and, after subjecting it to a mock trial, cut off its head and three fingers, and threw it into the Tiber. He was subsequently deposed, and strangled in prison. In the years that followed, the power of electing to the popedom fell into the hands of the intriguing and licentious Theodora, and her equally unprincipled daughters, Theodora and Marozia. These women, members of a patrician family, by their arts and beauty, obtained an unbounded influence over the aristocratic tyrants of the city. One of the Theodoras appointed a lover, and Marozia a son, to the holy see. The grandson of the latter, Octavian, succeeding to her power, as well as to the civil government of the city, elevated himself, on the death of the then Pope, to the apostolic chair, at the age of eighteen, under the title of John XII. His career was in keeping with such a commencement. "The Lateran palace," says Mr. Bowden, "was disgraced by becoming a receptacle for courtesans, and decent females were terrified from pilgrimages to the threshold of the Apostles by the reports which were spread abroad of the lawless impurity and violence of their representative and successor" (vol. i. p. 83). At length he was carried off by a rapid illness, or by the consequences of a blow received in the prosecution of his intrigues. Boniface VII., in the space of a few weeks after his elevation, plundered the treasury and basilica of St. Peter of all he could conveniently

carry off, and fled to Constantinople. John XVIII. expressed his readiness, in consideration of a sum of money from the Emperor Basil, to recognise the right of the Greek Patriarch to the title of ecumenical or universal bishop, and the consequent degradation of his own see; and was only prevented by the general indignation excited by the report of his intention. Benedict IX. was consecrated Pope, according to some authorities, at the age of ten or twelve years, and became notorious for adulteries and murders. At length he resolved on marrying his first cousin, and when her father would not assent except on the condition of his resigning the popedom, he sold it for a large sum and consecrated the purchaser as his successor.

Such are a few of the most prominent features of the ecclesiastical history of these dreary times, when, in the words of St. Bruno, "the world lay in wickedness, holiness had disappeared, justice had perished, and truth had been buried; Simon Magus lording it over the Church, whose bishops and priests were given to luxury and fornication." The external causes of this woful corruption were, as we have already noticed, two: secular abundance and secular destitution. Never was instanced more forcibly the meaning of the divine petition, "Give me neither poverty nor riches." As regards the Roman see, its humiliations were the result of secular violence. If, as was not an uncommon idea in the middle ages, Antichrist was, according to the words of prophecy, to seat himself by force in the high throne of the Apostle, to the overthrow of its rightful occupant, surely we may well recognise in the mock-popes and anti-popes of that period the types of the fulfilment. The imperial power, begun in Charlemagne, becoming extinct, Rome became the prey of the lawless and licentious nobles of the neighbouring Campagna. The pontifical elections were brought completely under their control, and it was by their creatures, violently introduced, that the holy see was subjected to the defilements which we have been describing. In France and Germany, on the other hand, the corruption was far more the direct sin of the Church, which had become secularised by the power and wealth with which the system of Charlemagne had burdened it;

and thus the continuance of that system led to the same results in the north which its extinction occasioned in the south. But on this subject let us hear Mr. Bowden:—

“The Church, in the transalpine dominions of Charlemagne, bore a character materially modified by the rudeness of her semi-barbarous members; and the efforts of that monarch, exerted towards her refinement, promoted at the same time her secularisation. His own idea of her nature and essence seems to have been influenced by the impressions natural to a temporal and military monarch. The Pope, as we have seen, he treated in several acts of government as his official adviser or chancellor; and his bishops, whom he endowed with ample territories, became his barons—his counsellors and ministers at home, and the governors of his provinces abroad. Their positions in the new bishoprics partook, indeed, in some measure, of the military character, as it was to them that the sovereign looked to repress the rebellions of his recently-acquired subjects, as well as to resist the incursions of barbarous hordes from the wastes beyond the limits of his territory. And even those prelates who had been fixed in stations apparently less likely to bring them into immediate contact with military operations, became, soon after the great monarch’s death, of necessity involved in the general movement, military as well as civil, which ensued from the interminable feuds of his degenerate descendants. The spiritual dignitaries, therefore, of the whole Carlovingian empire were placed in a false and unecclesiastical position: and this circumstance, viewed in connection with the general rudeness of their age, and with the gross views and habits natural to nations just reclaimed, and that in the mass from idolatry, will in great measure enable us to understand the deplorable account given of the Western Church in the ninth century by the writers of the time.

“. . . This diversion, so to call it, of the episcopate from its original destination, brought about, as a matter of course, the introduction into the episcopal body of persons by no means qualified for sacerdotal pre-eminence. In theory, the right of election to vacant bishoprics was recognised by Charlemagne and his descendants as existing, according to ancient and canonical practice, in the clergy and people of the diocese. But the founder of the Carlovingian dynasty was on several occasions induced, either by peculiar circumstances, or by the ambition and intrigues of those about him, to exercise a more

than merely influential or confirmatory authority on such occasions. . . . Whatever, indeed, might have been thought of the Christian liberty of the Church in the selection of her spiritual pastors, the sovereign had unquestionably a plausible right to dictate in the nomination of those to whom he was to look for the maintenance of order, the administration of justice, and the collection of revenue, in the different districts of his empire. The transfer of elective power from the hands of the Church herself to those of the temporal sovereign may be regarded as a natural and necessary accompaniment to the process of her internal secularisation.”—Vol. i. pp. 42-46.

Mr. Bowden’s able sketch is too long to quote entire, but we must gratify ourselves with another portion of it on the same subject:—

“No sooner, indeed, had the munificence of Charlemagne rendered offices in the Church objects of eager desire to the worldly and the covetous, than the crime which, from the unhappy man who first attempted to purchase the gifts of the Holy Spirit, has received the appellation of simony, began to spread through the Western empire to a fearful extent; and it became customary to purchase with gold, as well admittance into every rank of the sacred ministry, as the pastoral mission implied in the appointment to stations of ecclesiastical superintendence and responsibility. As early as 829 the prelates assembled in council at Paris found it necessary to urge Louis the Debonair to use all his influence in extirpating ‘this heresy so detestable, this pest so hateful to God,’ from the Roman Church. The synod of Meaux, in 845, renewed the warning. And Leo IV., in or about 847, denounced it in an epistle to the Bishops of Brittany as a crime condemned by many councils. But it was difficult to impress the enormity of the offence upon an age which had become accustomed to see not only ecclesiastical offices, but holy orders themselves, bestowed on grounds the most frivolous or unworthy. The nobles, in those times, continually procured the ordination of their younger sons or relatives, for the sole purpose of qualifying them for the acceptance of lucrative benefices; giving them, while they did so, the same military training and secular habits with the rest of the family. Others procured the admission to the priesthood of dependants whom they intended to retain in subordinate stations in their household. ‘Such,’ says the high-principled Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons in the time of Louis the Debonair, ‘is

the disgrace of our times, a disgrace to be deplored with the whole fountain of our tears, that there is scarcely one to be found who aspires to any degree of honour or temporal distinction who has not his domestic priest ; and this, not that he may obey him, but that he may command his obedience alike in things lawful and things unlawful ; in things human and things divine ; so that these chaplains are constantly to be found serving the tables, mixing the strained wine, leading out the dogs, managing the ladies' horses, or looking after the lands.' And because it was of course impossible, however they might have heard it, to obtain, for stations so degrading, respectable members of the sacerdotal body ; 'for what good clergyman,' continues the indignant prelate just quoted, 'could bear to defile his character and life with men like these?' they selected, without the slightest reference either to knowledge or principle, those whom they thought likely to perform most satisfactorily the various domestic offices above enumerated, and then called on Agobard himself, or his brother prelates, to admit, as a matter of course, the 'clerkings,' as they contemptuously styled them, to holy orders ; a request with which the regulations of the empire, though no human enactments could in truth be binding in such a matter, compelled the insulted bishops to comply."—Vol. i. p. 48.

Had we lived in such deplorable times as have been above described, when Satan seemed to have been let loose at the end of his thousand years, and had we been blessed with any portion of divine light to understand, and of love to desire better things, we might have asked whether it was conceivable that the Church should ever recover itself from the abyss into which it was sunk. Where was the motive principle—where the fulcrum, by which it was to be righted? What was left but for matters to become worse and worse, till the last ray of truth and righteousness died away, and the last saint was gathered in, and the end of all things came, and the Judge with it? One thing we should have felt for certain, that if it was possible to retrieve the Church, it must be by some external power; she was helpless and resourceless, and the civil power must interfere, or there was no hope. So thought the young and zealous emperor, Henry III., who, though unhappily far from a perfect character, yet deeply felt the shame to which the Immaculate

Bride was exposed, and determined with his own right hand to work her deliverance. In one respect, indeed, he was plainly unequal for so high a mission, had he had other credentials of it: he who was not possessed of the grace of personal purity could not hope to remove the more flagrant scandals with which the clergy of the day were laden. But this good thing had he, that amid all his ecclesiastical prerogatives and professions, he had in no single instance incurred the guilt of simony; he had the most awful impression and the most acute feelings of its heinousness; and thus, if he could not animadvert upon one of the chief sins of the day, he might aspire to be a censor of the other. And so much is undeniable, that, though he cannot be considered as regularly called to the work, and though a movement had already begun, as we shall presently see, in the Church itself, which, humanly speaking, would have done it without him, yet, in matter of fact, this well-meaning and interesting prince did begin that reformation which ended in the purification and monarchical estate of the Church.

He thus dealt with the bishops of his own country:—

“Summoning around him, during the summer of 1047, the prelates of his country, he thus spoke:—‘It is with sorrow that I address you, ye that stand in Christ’s stead over the Church which He purchased with His blood. For, as it was out of the free grace of God the Father that He was given unto us, and born of the Blessed Virgin, so did He enjoin His Apostles, “Freely ye have been received, freely give.” But ye, corrupted by avarice, are under a curse, because ye give and take in barter for the holy treasures which ye dispense: and even my father, for whose soul I am most anxious, was in his lifetime too much led away by this accursed covetousness. He, among you, who feels himself sullied by this sin, should—according to the letter of the canon—should be forthwith deprived of the ecclesiastical office,—whatever it be,—which he may hold. For this—this is the fearful sin,—sin which brings down judicial calamities upon our suffering people: this it is which Heaven scourges among us by famine, by epidemic diseases, and by the sword.’

“The prelates around him, too generally conscious of a participation in the guilt which he denounced, shrunk within themselves; and,

aware as well of his determination of character, as of his plenitude of power, trembled for the issue. Great therefore was their relief, however overpowering their shame, when, in answer to their acknowledgment of guilt, and supplication for clemency, the monarch thus continued:—‘Go hence, employ that well which you have ill obtained; and forget not, in your prayers, to implore mercy for the soul of my father, as of one involved in like criminality with yourselves.’ He then dismissed them, demanding, previously to their departure, their assent to a decree, which enacted that no office or station in the Church should thenceforth be made the subject of purchase or sale, and that whosoever should attempt the practice of such nefarious traffic should be deprived of any office which he might have attained, and be visited with the anathema of the Church. While, with regard to his own future conduct, the emperor, in the presence of the council, solemnly pledged himself as follows:—‘As God has freely, of His mere mercy, bestowed upon me the crown of the empire, so will I give freely and without price all things that pertain unto His religion.’”—Vol. i. pp. 131, 132.

But he was aware that the work of reform, to be thoroughly executed, must proceed from Rome, as the centre of the ecclesiastical state, and he determined, upon those imperial precedents and feudal principles which we have already brought before the reader, to appoint a pope, who should be the instrument of his general reformation. The reigning Pope at this time was Gregory VI., and he introduces us to so curious a history that we shall devote some sentences to it. Gregory was the identical personage who had bought the papal office of the profligate Benedict IX. for a large sum, and was consecrated by him, and yet he was far from a bad sort of man after all. As to his traffic in holy things, he seems to have viewed it in the light of the worthy persons in our own days, whose advertisements concerning the sale or purchase of advowsons or presentations figure in the newspapers; and he really does seem to have committed his act of simony with the very best intentions, which he did in fact fulfil, so far as his bargain was made good to him. He had been known in the world as John Gratianus; and at the time of his promotion was arch-priest of

Rome. "He was considered," says Mr. Bowden, "in those bad times, more than ordinarily religious; he had lived free from the gross vices by which the clergy were too generally disgraced." He is described as "*idiotia et miræ simplicitatis*," and what perhaps is included in this account of him, he was unlettered. He could not be quite said to have come into possession of his purchase; for Benedict, his predecessor, being disappointed in his intended bride, returned to Rome after an absence of three months, and resumed his pontifical station, while the party of his intended father-in-law had had sufficient influence to create a pope of their own, John, Bishop of Sabina, who paid a high price for his elevation, and took the title of Sylvester III. And thus there were three self-styled popes at once in the Holy City, Benedict performing his sacred functions at the Lateran, Gregory at St. Peter's, and Sylvester at Santa Maria Maggiore. Gregory, however, after a time, seemed to preponderate over his antagonists: he maintained a body of troops, and with these he suppressed the suburban robbers, who hindered the pilgrims' approach to Rome, and placed himself at their head. Expelling them from the sacred limits of St. Peter's, he carried his arms farther till he had cleared the neighbouring towns and roads of these marauders. On an outcry being raised at the unclerical character of such performances, brilliant as they were, he associated with him Lorenzo, Archbishop of Amalphi, who was an exile at Rome, as his coadjutor, and, while the latter understood the direct duties of the papal office and government, he devoted himself to that police department in which he seemed so much to excel.

This was the point of time at which the Imperial Reformer made his visitation of the Church of the Apostles. He came into Italy in the autumn of 1046, and held a Council at Sutri, a town about thirty miles to the north of Rome. Gregory was allowed to preside; and when, under his auspices, the abdication of Benedict had been recorded, and Sylvester had been stripped of his sacerdotal rank and shut up in a monastery for the rest of his life, Gregory's own turn came, and, as there was no one competent to judge the highest ecclesiastical authority

upon earth, as he was admitted really to be, the following device was taken to get rid of him :—

“ His (Henry’s) bishops, the cases of Gregory’s rivals having been disposed of, requested the pontiff to state, for their information, the circumstances of his own election to the papal office; and when they had thus drawn from him an admission of the unholy traffic by which that transaction had been accomplished, they brought before him the impropriety of his conduct in a manner so glaring, that the confounded pontiff at length exclaimed, ‘ I call God to witness that, in doing what I did, I hoped to obtain the forgiveness of my sins and the grace of God. But now that I see the snare into which the enemy has entrapped me, tell me what I must do?’ The bishops having thus obtained their point, replied, ‘ Judge thyself—condemn thyself with thine own mouth—better will it be for thee to live, like the holy Peter, poor in this world and to be blest in another, than like the magician Simon, whose example misled thee, to shine in riches here, and to receive hereafter the sentence of condemnation.’ And the penitent Gregory, in obedience to the suggestion, spoke as follows :—‘ I, Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, pronounce that, on account of the shameful trafficking, the heretical simony which took place at my election, I am deprived of the Roman see. Do you agree,’ he concluded, ‘ to this?’ ‘ We acquiesce,’ was the reply, ‘ in your decision;’ and the ex-Pope at once divested himself of the insignia of pontifical authority.”—Vol. i. p. 119.

The new pope whom the Emperor gave to the Church instead of Gregory VI., Clement II., a man of excellent character, died within the year. Damasus II., who was his second nomination, died in three or four weeks after his formal assumption of his pontifical duties. Bruno, Bishop of Toul, was his third choice; he was a relation of Henry’s, mild and unambitious in character, fervent in his devotion, courteous and popular in his manners, and possessed, if not of commanding talents, of considerable energy and activity of mind. He was far from desiring his elevation; when the proposal was first made to him, he requested three days to consider it, at the end of which he made a confession of his faults before the assembled council, with the hope of obtaining their permission to decline

it. But they overruled his objections, and he found himself compelled on the spot to assume the style and honours of a pontiff. Such was the person, and such the manner of his advancement, who is now known as St. Leo, the ninth of that name.

And now we are arrived at the period when the State reformer struck his foot against the hidden rock, and found to his surprise that in that apparently disorganised and lifeless frame, which he was attempting to new-make, there was a soul and a power of self-action adequate both to its recovery and its resistance against foreign interference. He had chosen a Pope, but *quis custodiat ipsos custodes?* What was to keep fast that Pope in that very view of the relation of the State to the Church which he himself took? What is to secure the Pope from some Hildebrand at his elbow, who, a young man himself, shall rehearse, in the person of his superior, that part which he is one day to play in his own, as Gregory VII.? Such was the very fact: Hildebrand was with Leo, and thus commences the ecclesiastical career of that wonderful man, to whose history Mr. Bowden has devoted his reading. Hildebrand was at this time from thirty to forty years of age, having been born between 1010 and 1020; his birthplace, as it is supposed, Soana, in Tuscany; his father a carpenter. He had been soon removed from home to the care of an uncle, the Abbot of St. Mary's on the Aventine, who is supposed to be the same with that Laurence, Archbishop of Amalfi, whose enforcement of ecclesiastical power had led to his banishment from his diocese by Guaimar, prince of the city. Such a man was a happy master for the young champion of the Church; and under his auspices Hildebrand had rapidly acquired a knowledge of the seven liberal sciences, while he exhibited from his earliest years the rudiments of that devotional temperament which in after-life so strikingly characterised him. He was, says one of his annalists, a monk from his boyhood; his life, from its very commencement, was one of abstinence, mortification, and self-command.

Arrived at man's estate he had undertaken a journey across

the Alps, and resided for some time in the celebrated monastery of Cluni in Burgundy, the strictness of which formed an acceptable contrast, in the eyes of our austere youth, with the laxity of manners which prevailed at Rome. The Abbot Odilo, himself an eminent saint, was equally pleased with Hildebrand, applying to him prophetically the announcement used by the angel concerning the commissioned Reformer of the first advent, "He shall be great in the sight of the Lord." On his return to Rome, disgusted with the prevalent corruptions, he would have quitted the city again and for good, but was fixed in a resolution to stay after an occurrence not unlike, in character and termination, if we may compare together such opposite stations as those of a Pope and a Lord Mayor, the "turn-again" passage in the history of Whittington. He afterwards served under the unfortunate Gregory VI., a fit leader of such as Hildebrand, so far as his object in securing the papacy to himself was that of claiming for the Roman clergy and people the free election of their spiritual pastor. On Gregory's downfall Hildebrand was carried by Henry across the Alps with his patron, and thus he was at hand when Leo, on his appointment to the papacy, invited his assistance. Such was Hildebrand, and such his previous history; and now what advice will he give to the mild and unassuming Bruno? Mr. Bowden shall tell us:—

"Bruno knew and respected his zeal and ability, and, as he happened to be at Worms during the session of the council, the newly-chosen pontiff sent for him, and requested him to be the companion of his intended journey to Rome. 'I cannot,' said Hildebrand, 'accompany you;' and, when pressed to declare the reason of this, probably unexpected, refusal, said, 'Because you go to occupy the government of the Roman Church, not in virtue of a regular and canonical institution to it, but as appointed to it by secular and kingly power.' This led to a discussion, in which Bruno, gentle and candid by nature, and already perhaps inclined in his heart to favour the principles which Hildebrand now advocated before him, permitted himself to be convinced that the legitimate electors to the see of St. Peter were the Roman clergy and the people; and he prepared to shape his course accordingly. Returning to Toul, to make the necessary preparations, and to take a

farewell of his diocese, he set out thence in a style very different from that which had usually been adopted by the nominees of Teutonic sovereigns in their inaugural journeys to the papal city. Instead of the rich pontifical attire which they were wont, from the day of their nomination, to assume, he clothed himself in the simple habit of a pilgrim, thus publicly testifying to the world, that notwithstanding the act of the German Henry and his council, he considered that his real election was yet to come. Leaving Toul on the third day from the festival of Christmas, he halted, on his way, at the monastery of Cluni, and from hence, if not from Toul itself, was accompanied by Hildebrand, in his unostentatious progress to the papal city. At that city, bare-footed, and clad in the humble guise which he had thus assumed, Bruno arrived in the early part of February 1049; and, as he found the clergy and people assembled, and uttering hymns of thanksgiving and shouts of joy in honour of his arrival, he at once addressed them, and having announced to them the mode of his election in Germany, entreated them fully and freely to declare their sentiments on the subject. Their election, he said, was of paramount authority to every other; and if what had been done beyond the Alps did not meet with their general approval, he was ready to return—a pilgrim as he had come—and to shake off the burden of responsibility which he had only upon compulsion undertaken. His discourse was responded to by a unanimous shout of approval; and Bruno, installed without delay in his office, assumed thenceforward the name of Leo IX.”—Pp. 137-139.

It seems, then, there is a hidden power in the Church struggling with Henry in the person of his own nominees, and that as regards the very point through which the system of Charlemagne introduced corruption into it. The State appointment to Church offices, which was the result of the Carolingian changes, implied the secular character of the offices to which it was an appointment; that presumed secular character led to their being treated as secular, and to their holders living in a secular way, to simony and self-indulgence. Henry's reform then was conducted on a principle which involved and perpetuated the very evils which it was intended to remove; if the Church was under secular jurisdiction, it was fairly open to secular use. This feeling it is which some power within the Church, the Church's instinct

or divine sense, seems to be travailing with and bringing into effect; and now let us, under Mr. Bowden's guidance, inquire into the history of the momentous doctrine in which it issued.

When Christians have but a partial confidence in their own principles, there is a great temptation, when Church matters go wrong, to give up God's way, and take whatever is recommended by the expediency of the moment. The ancient and true methods of proceeding appear quite out of date and place; the old materials, instruments, centres, and laws, on which the Church once moved, are apparently worn out by use; and what remains but to assume whatever comes to hand? We need not go to past ages for illustrations of this remark. In all times weeds and scum, and all that is worthless, float on the surface, and precious gems lie at the bottom of the deep; and where there is neither faith to accept, nor penetration to apprehend, whatever does not obtrude itself upon the senses, men are very ready to put up with what they see, in despair of meeting with what may be more to their purpose. Thus in Hildebrand's age, it might be plausibly argued that ecclesiastical affairs had, in the changes of society, devolved to the civil power; that the State was their natural administrator; that it had the means, and none but it, of reforming the Church. It might be urged that the old high spirit, beautiful as it had been, was no more; that there was no place within the Church on which a reformer could place himself, who desired to operate upon it; that whether he attempted pastors or flock, regulars or seculars, the ground would give way under him. The necessity of the case then formed the vindication of the Emperor's conduct, were there no other; and yet, in matter of fact, out of that hopeless chaos rose, and upon it seated itself, the broadest and most sovereign rule which the Christian world has seen.

In truth, taking the corruptions of the day at the worst, they were principally on the surface of the Church. Scandals are petulant and press into view, and they are exaggerated from the shock they communicate. Friends exaggerate through indignation, foes through malevolence. In the worst of times there is always a remnant of holy men, out of sight, scanty perhaps in

numbers, but great in moral strength, and there is always even in the multitude an acknowledgment of truths which they do not themselves practise. Among all men, educated and unlettered, there is a tacit recognition of certain principles as the cardinal points of society, which very rarely come distinctly into view, and of which the mind is the less conscious because of their intimate proximity to it. Such there were in Hildebrand's day, and the secret of his success lay in his having the genius or the faith to appeal to them. We should rather say the faith; for this is remarkably the case, and is exemplified in our own day; that what is commonly admired as successful talent is far more a firm realising grasp of some great principle, and that power of developing it in all directions, and that nerve to abide faithful to it, which is involved in such a true apprehension.

The fundamental notion of the Hildebrandine period was the ecumenical power of the Pope, which had been matured by a variety of circumstances, and remained in the European mind even in the most scandalous and trying times. Mr. Bowden has struck off some of these operative causes with great power. In the first place, Rome was the only apostolical see in the West, and thereby had a natural claim to the homage of those which were less distinguished. This pre-eminence was heightened by her inflexible orthodoxy amid the doctrinal controversies in which the Eastern sees had successively erred, and by the office of arbitrator and referee, which she held amid their rivalries and quarrels. Further, when the descent of the barbarians had overwhelmed or exterminated the nations and churches of the empire, Christian Rome became the instrument of the conversion of the heathen population, and the patriarchal centre of the new world which it created. And when the seat of temporal power had been removed to Constantinople, or re-founded in France or Germany, the Roman see came into a position of independence and sovereignty which could not be the lot of Churches living under the immediate shadow of the imperial throne. It became the rival of the eastern Cæsars and the viceroy of the western. Moreover, in the age of feudalism, when monarchy was the only form of civil polity, there would be at once a tendency in the

ecclesiastical state to imitate it, and an expediency in order to meet and counteract its aggressions. And, amid national changes and the rise and fall of dynasties, it was natural for struggling leaders to seek support from a settled power like Rome, and to recognise it by asking its exercise. And it must be considered too that power has always a tendency to increase itself, and that independently, as it would seem, of the wishes or efforts of its possessors. To these historical causes doctrinal sanctions, true or pretended, lent their aid. From the first, indeed, prerogatives were attached to the Church of Rome which belonged to no other but her; but these were extravagantly increased by certain well-known forgeries, of which Mr. Bowden gives us an interesting account. The chief of these were the pretended Decretals—a variety of letters, decrees, and other documents, purporting to be the work of bishops of Rome from the very earliest times. This celebrated forgery made its appearance between the years 830 and 850, and, what is remarkable, did not proceed from Rome, but from the North, from Mentz, being, as would appear, the work of a deacon of that city of the name of Benedict. Under all circumstances it is natural for the weaker portion of the community to desire the means of appeal from the arbitrary will of their rulers, and that to a power safe from the local influences of those from whom they themselves desire protection; and this operated in an especial way in disposing the German bishops towards Rome, instead of their own metropolitans, at a time when the civil power was in the hands of tyrants but partially reclaimed from barbarism. The churches of Germany then naturally looked to Rome for protection against their secular governors; and the forgery in question was the expression of their previous wishes, as well as the formal basis in justification of them in time to come. The spurious series, says Mr. Bowden, is throughout consistent with itself, and is occupied throughout in asserting the Church's independence from every species of secular dominion or jurisdiction; and "the bishop of the holy and universal Church" is declared to be the Pope. To him all cases of importance are to be referred; he is the head and cardinal point of all Churches, and by him they are all to be

governed. Such was the combination of circumstances under which the supremacy of the Pope over other bishops had been established, both in fact and in public opinion; and in this connection we are led to quote the following just and important remark of our author :—

“The pontiffs,” he says, “did not so much claim new privileges for themselves as deprive their episcopal brethren of privileges originally common to the hierarchy. Even the title by which these autocratical prelates, in the plenitude of their power, delighted to style themselves, ‘*Summus Sacerdos*,’ ‘*Pontifex Maximus*,’ ‘*Vicarius Christi*,’ ‘*Papa*’ itself, had, nearer to the primitive times, been the honourable appellations of every bishop; as ‘*Sedes Apostolica*’ had been the designation of every bishop’s throne. The ascription of these titles therefore to the Pope only gave to the terms a new force, because that ascription became exclusive; because, that is, the bishops in general were stripped of honours to which their claims were as well founded as those of their Roman brother; who became, by the change, not so strictly universal, as sole, bishop. The degradation of the collective hierarchy, as involved in such a relative exaltation of one of its members, was seen and resisted by one not likely to entertain unreasonable or exaggerated views of the dangers to be expected from Roman aggrandisement, the truly great and good Pope Gregory I. ‘I beseech your holiness,’ said this pontiff to the patriarch of Alexandria, who had addressed him, contrary to his previously expressed desire, by the title of ‘*Papa Universalis*,’ ‘to do so no more; for that is taken from you which is bestowed, in an unreasonable degree, upon another. . . . I do not reckon that to be honour in which I see their due honour taken from my brethren; for my honour is the honour of the Universal Church, the solid strength of my brethren: I then am truly honoured when the proper share of honour is assigned to each and to all. But if your holiness styles me ‘*Universal Pope*,’ you renounce that dignity for yourself which you ascribe universally to me. But let this be done no more. . . . My predecessors have endeavoured, by cherishing the honour of all members of the priesthood throughout the world, to preserve their own in the sight of the Almighty.’

“And even at a much more mature stage of the growth of papal pretension, in the eleventh century itself, we find the pontiff Leo IX., in an epistle to the Grecian patriarch Michael Cerularius, repeating the

assertion, made by Gregory in the above epistle, that his predecessor and namesake, Leo the Great, to whom the title of ecumenical patriarch had been offered by the Council of Chalcedon, had repudiated the proud appellation, by the ascription of which to one prelate an affront would be offered to the equal dignity of all."—Vol. i. pp. 64-66.

The causes we have been enumerating had effected the introduction of papal supremacy even before the dark times to which the Hildebrandine period succeeded; and it is observable, that even amid the moral and political degradation of the Roman see in the ninth and tenth centuries, the theory still maintained its hold upon the public mind. We find Dietrich, Archbishop of Treves in 969, soliciting and obtaining from John XIII. for himself and his successors, that precedence among the archbishops of Germany which the office of legate was considered to confer. Stephen of Hungary, a secular prince, at the end of the tenth century, with the view of strengthening his authority over his half-converted subjects, had obtained from Sylvester II. the permission to combine his regal title with that of apostolic legate. Gregory XV., the immediate predecessor of Sylvester, excommunicated the son of Hugh Capet for an illegal marriage, and the Archbishop of Treves, who had solemnised it, with the other bishops who had countenanced it with their presence; and on his defying the sentence, had put his kingdom under an interdict, with such an effect that the prince was deserted by his whole court and household, and even the two domestics who remained with him, avoiding his touch as infected, threw every plate and vessel out of which he had eaten and drunk into the fire. And, to take a fresh specimen of prerogative, John XV about the same date had begun the practice of canonisation, acting, as he expressed it, "by the authority of the blessed Peter, prince of Apostles," from whom he claimed to be the one visible head of the community of the faithful, the "bishop of the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church." It cannot be denied then, that in spite of the dreadful demoralisation of the Church and popedom in the tenth and eleventh centuries, there was laid in the temper of the age and the feelings of society a deep and firm groundwork, if men could be found who had the

heart to appeal to it, for reforming and purifying the Church by an internal effort, and without recurring to the temporal power, which seemed at first sight the obvious, or rather the only resource.

Here then was the point of battle between the Church and the State. The State said to the Church, "I am the only power which can reform you; you hold of me, and your dignities and offices are in my gift." The Church said to the State, "She who wields the power even of smiting kings, cannot be a king's creature; and if you attempt to reform, you will be planting the root of corruption by the same hand which cuts off its branches."

The struggle between the parties began from the commencement of Hildebrand's political history. Before his intimacy with Leo IX., he had, as we have seen, been connected with the unfortunate Gregory VI.; yet, even he, guilty as he was of a crime to which Hildebrand so earnestly opposed himself from first to last, committed it with the object of asserting, against the aristocracy, the dormant right of the Roman clergy and people to elect their own bishops. After this time Hildebrand seems to have been the chief mover in ecclesiastical movements in the papal city for a space of twenty-four years, till the time of his own elevation, in which time he served the Popes Leo IX., Victor II., Stephen IX., Nicholas II., and Alexander II.—all of them virtuous or even austere persons,—steadily developing and realising by successive acts the purification of the Church and the theory of her independence and sovereignty. For the interesting history of this period, we must refer to Mr. Bowden's second book, and shall content ourselves here with some sketches of scenes and characters which occur in the course of it, and which will introduce the reader naturally to some specimens of the growth of papal power in that interval, and the mode of it.

The pontificate of Leo IX., whom we have already brought before him, supplies an illustration of the mixture of catholic truth with wild romance which pervades the history of the times. In his own person he was a model of that reform which he compassed for the whole Church.

“The personal habits of Leo, while he thus actively laboured in the cause of reformation, were of the most ascetic nature ; his life formed a consistent course of abstinence and self-denial ; and the hours of sleep were systematically abridged by his devotions : for, when at Rome, it was his wont, thrice in the week, to walk barefoot at midnight from the palace of the Lateran to the church of St. Peter—from one extremity, that is, of Rome to the other—accompanied by two or three only of his clergy, for the purposes of praise and prayer : a spectacle which might well strike those with astonishment who were accustomed to the scenes of infamy and riot by which the palace in question, and the papal city in general, had been disgraced under the licentious pontiffs of the preceding age.”—Vol. i. p. 152.

Yet this pure and holy man is next presented to us as leading a military expedition against the Normans, which he seems to have thought to be as little out of character with his pontifical office as a rector of a parish among ourselves in being a magistrate and reading the riot act, or a clergyman serving the office of proctor in our universities. The Normans were at this time in Calabria and Apulia, whither they had at first come as pilgrims, then done battle as champions of the faith, then served as mercenaries, and at length spread devastation as marauders. The pagan to whom they opposed themselves was the Saracen, who from time to time made descents upon the coast, though his power was on the decline. Mr. Bowden gives the following account of the first collision between young faith and degenerate misbelief, and its results :—

“In or about the year 1002, a petty flotilla appeared before Salerno, and a body of Saracens, landing under the walls of the place, demanded, with the customary menaces, a pecuniary contribution. Guaimar III., Prince of Salerno, and his timid subjects felt that they had no course to adopt but submission ; and their surprise was great, when about forty pilgrims from a distant land, who happened to be at the moment within their walls, requested of the prince arms, horses, and permission to chastise these insolent marauders. The request was readily complied with : the pilgrim warriors, accoutred in haste, galloped eagerly forth through the gates of Salerno ; the Saracens, confounded and dismayed, fled tumultuously from the onset of this unexpected foe ; and esteemed

themselves happy when their retreating barks bore them out of reach of the sword of the victorious Normans.

“The delighted Guaimar would willingly have been prodigal in his bounty toward his gallant deliverers; but he experienced a second surprise when the costly presents which he laid before them were firmly, though courteously, rejected. ‘For the love of God, and of the Christian faith,’ said the chivalrous pilgrims, ‘we have done what we have done; and we may neither accept of wages for such service, nor delay our return to our homes.’ They departed accordingly; but not unaccompanied. Guaimar sent with them, to their native land, envoys, laden with presents, such as might best tempt the countrymen of these hardy and disinterested warriors to enlist in his service. Specimens of southern fruits, superb vestments, golden bits, and magnificent horse-trappings attracted and dazzled the eyes of the population of Normandy, and produced on the enterprising youth of the province their natural effect. Encouraged by the glowing description given by their friends of the sunny clime which they had visited, and of the opportunities, there offered, of enterprise and honour, swarms of northern warriors crossed the Alps: they were readily and honourably welcomed by Guaimar and other princes of southern Italy; and engaged, under one banner or another, in most of the intestine quarrels which at that period distracted the country.”—Vol. i. pp. 156, 157.

The Normans, as indeed this extract shows, were a people of warm religious feelings; but a young nation has the waywardness and uncertainty of children, and every now and then these soldiers of fortune, turning to plunder, were tempted to rifle, for the sake of gain, the holy shrines which, on their first appearance, they had come to worship. Tidings of their sacrilegious acts reached the ears of Leo. “And when,” Mr. Bowden tells us, “he saw that the insulters of the Church were also the ruthless oppressors of their fellow-creatures, when he beheld the southern gates of Rome daily thronged by the wretched inhabitants of Apulia, who, destitute, blinded, and horribly mutilated, were seeking a refuge from further tyranny behind the sheltering walls of the papal city, the pitying pontiff yielded himself entirely to the impulses of his benevolent nature,” and led an army in person against the Normans. He crossed the Alps and gained of the Emperor 500 Germans, most of them

volunteers ; then returning, he raised the banner of St. Peter in Italy, and a motley company from Apulia, Campania, and Ancona flocked around it. It is not known whether Hildebrand sanctioned this measure. Benno, "his embittered adversary," as Mr. Bowden calls him, charges him with doing so ; but "the statement," he continues, "appears to be unsupported by other contemporaneous authority ; and the work of Benno is filled with so many palpable calumnies against Hildebrand, that nothing in the nature of an accusation can be worthy of credit which rests upon his evidence alone." It is undeniable, however, that Hildebrand, when Pope, himself entertained a somewhat similar project. On the other hand, his intimate friend, and the principal organ of his party, Peter Damiani, has left on record his protest against the assumption, on the part of the successor of St. Peter, of that earthly sword which our Lord himself denied the Apostle. Anyhow, it was unprecedented in that age, considering Leo was Pope, and the enemy a Christian people ; though bishops were in the habit of accompanying their retainers to the field, and Pope John X., somewhat more than a century before, had engaged Mahommedans in battle.

"It was on the 18th of June, 1053, that Leo's troops confronted those of the enemy near the town of Civitella. The Normans, when aware of his intentions, had made all preparations in their power to ward off the coming blow. William Iron-arm was no more ; but his brothers, Humphrey and Robert—the latter of whom, subsequently surnamed Guiscard, had recently arrived in Apulia with a considerable reinforcement to the Norman forces—succeeded to the command of his intrepid warriors ; and Richard, Count of Aversa, the chief of a smaller, but independent, Norman colony in Italy, brought all the force he could muster to the defence of the common cause. But the Normans were dispirited : rumour had magnified among them the scale of the papal preparations, and they were awed by the sacred character of him in whom, even while he was their enemy, they recognised their spiritual parent. The heralds, therefore, who approached Leo while he was yet within the walls of Civitella, assumed a humble tone ; they deprecated his hostility, and informed him that the Norman princes, though they declined to abandon possessions which they had won, were

ready to hold their conquests thenceforward by his grant, and do suit and service for them to him, as to their lord paramount. But the tall, bulky Germans, by whom the pontiff was surrounded, smiled in scorn when they beheld the diminutive though active forms of their adversaries; and Leo, inspired by their confidence, as well as by his conviction of the goodness of his cause, rejected the overtures of the Norman leaders, and demanded the total abandonment of the lands which they had recently usurped from St. Peter. This the Normans declined to concede, and therefore, feeling that no other alternative lay before them, they gave the signal for battle, before Leo had issued from the gates of Civitella. The result of the action which now took place, falsified alike the confident anticipations of the one party, and the desponding auguries of the other. The impetuous charge of the Norman chivalry at once unmanned the timid Italians who composed the bulk of Leo's army, and who fled in every possible direction. Werner and his German band met the shock with the calm courage of their country; but the Normans, unresisted elsewhere, turned their flanks, and hemmed them in on every side; until this gallant troop, contending valiantly to the last, covered with their corpses the ground which they had occupied. But for their resistance—so sudden was the flight, so rapid the dispersion, of Leo's army—the business of the day might seem rather to deserve the name of a slaughter than of a battle.

“The conquering chiefs pushed on without delay, through the streets of Civitella, into the presence of Leo. But they no sooner beheld the venerable pontiff, than, exchanging the fierceness of the warrior for the subdued tone of the penitent, they fell at his feet, and in abasement and tears besought the absolution and the blessing of their vanquished enemy. Moved by this conduct, and induced by the exigency of his position, Leo revoked the sentence of anathema which he had pronounced against them; and they then escorted him with all reverence and honour to the city of Benevento. Here the humbled pontiff remained nine months, during which time, at the request of his captors, he consented to grant them, in the name of St. Peter, the investiture of all their conquests, made, or to be made, in Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily; which they were thenceforward to hold as fiefs of the holy see.”
—Vol. i. pp. 162-165.

By this turn of events, Leo's defeat and captivity involved more favourable results than could have been reaped from the

most brilliant victory. The Pope acquired a claim on the services of the Normans, as of vassals; and, moreover, recognition of his power to confer the investiture, as lord paramount, of extensive domains, over which they had held no previous sway. What was more the immediate purpose of the war, the presence of the mild old man succeeded in subduing the fierceness and cruelty with which the proceedings of the Normans had hitherto been attended; an effect which would be naturally promoted by their admission, in consequence of the compact, into the circle of recognised sovereigns and the responsibilities of legitimate power. However, Leo did not find all this consolation in the issue of his military exploits.

“His ardent temperament,” says Mr. Bowden, “had encouraged him too confidently to anticipate a blessing on his exertions; and the same disposition now led him to trace the displeasure of Heaven in his calamity. While at Benevento, he employed all his hours except those engaged in negotiation or other necessary business, in religious meditation, in prayer, and in exercises of ascetic devotion. Though his health was declining, a carpet on the bare earth was his ordinary couch, a stone his pillow, and a hair shirt his garment next the skin. Under such austerities, aided as they were in their effect by the sorrows and anxieties of his mind, his constitution gradually sank; and when he at length left Benevento, and returned, in March 1054, to the papal city, it was only to breathe his last there on the 19th of the following April, after having committed to his beloved friend Hildebrand the provisional government of the Roman Church, until a new pontiff should be appointed to the apostolic see.”—Vol. i. pp. 166, 167.

St. Peter Damiani, Bishop of Ostia, who has already been incidentally mentioned, is another personage of this period whom the course of the history brings before us, and to whom we think that Mr. Bowden is hardly fair, as regards one passage of his life, though he treats him always with that respect and honour which is his due. On his elevation to his see, Mr. Bowden thus describes him:—

“Damiani was a man of sincere and deep devotion, of extraordinary talents, and of a monastic austerity. He was of too ardent a temperament to be uniformly judicious in his proceedings; and his faith was of

a description which led him to receive, without question, a host of legends of the most absurd description. But there shone forth in him a singleness and purity of character which, in connection with his abilities, procured him the universal respect and admiration of his contemporaries. And though, in pushing to the extreme the notions of the age, he must be admitted to have played no unimportant part in forwarding the progress of doctrinal corruptions, yet his name—when the nature of his position is fairly taken into the account—can scarcely be thought undeserving of the veneration of posterity. His exaltation, in this instance, was resisted by him with all his might. He feared to be drawn from the unremitting austerities of his retirement; and it was not until he was threatened by Stephen and his council with excommunication, that he consented to change the life of seclusion and self-denial which he lived, for the activity and notoriety of a more responsible situation.”—Vol. i. pp. 189, 190.

After this he was sent to Milan, as legate, to set right the disorders of the Church, which the Milanese clergy attempted to shield from reform under colour of the dignity and independence of the Church over which St. Ambrose had presided. They asserted also their right to marriage, which was another point on which reform was demanded, on ground of a privilege granted them by the same saint. In this business he was associated with Anselm da Badagio, Bishop of Lucca, afterwards Pope Alexander II. The person named Ariald in the course of the extract was a deacon of Milan, who had headed the reforming party.

“Making their appearance in the long-disturbed city, these envoys found the archbishop and his clergy, however hostile in secret to their coming, prepared to acknowledge their authority, and to receive them with every outward mark and sign of deference. But the populace, moved perhaps by the secret instigations of their pastors, soon showed, disposed as they might be themselves to ridicule or revile these careless guides—that they were keenly jealous of the assumed independence of their native Church, and viewed with suspicion any papal interference with the proceedings of its governors. In tumultuous throngs they filled the streets, and entered the building in which the legates had convened the clerical body of the place. And their wrath was greatly

increased, when they there beheld Damiani, as chief legate, after himself assuming the principal seat of honour, place his colleague Anselm on his right, and then Archbishop Guido on his left. Loud murmurs filled the place at this seeming slight of their pastor, murmurs which that prelate artfully contrived to augment, by saying, with apparent humility, that he was in no way offended by this arrangement, but that he would sit, if commanded by the legates so to do, on a stool before their feet. The discontent at length broke out into open tumult,—the populace uttered loud cries of vengeance against the presumptuous legate, who had dared thus to insult the successor of St. Ambrose:—the clergy, eager to augment the fray, rang the alarm bell in the various churches of the city;—the confusion increased,—and even the life of Damiani was apparently in danger. But that bold and high-spirited man was equal to the crisis; ascending a pulpit, he showed himself prepared to address the tumultuous multitude. His dauntless bearing awed them to silence, and he was heard with attention, while with dignity, and all the eloquence which distinguished him, he set forth the claims which the mother Church of Rome possessed on the dutiful obedience of her daughter, the Church of Milan. He cited instances in which St. Ambrose himself had appealed to the protection of the Roman prelate, and acknowledged his pre-eminence. ‘Search,’ he concluded, ‘your own records, and if ye find not there that what we say is the truth, expose our falsehood. But if ye find us true, resist not the truth, resist not undutifully the voice of your mother; but from her, from whom ye first drew in the milk of apostolic faith, receive with gratitude the more solid food of heavenly doctrine.’

“This appeal, and the legate’s fearless demeanour, produced a sudden turn in the feelings of his hearers. The archbishop, too, felt it necessary now to rise, and to request his people to suffer the skilful physician who had just addressed them to do his best towards healing their spiritual sickness. The populace retired, soothed and tranquil, and the clergy offered no further opposition to the legatine authority. On Peter’s demand, their whole body, with the archbishop at their head, agreed to pledge themselves with a solemn vow against simony and clerical marriage. Ariald took the oath among them; and Peter, thus successful in his mission, pronounced in his official character the reconciliation of Milan to the apostolic see.”—Vol. i. pp. 208-210.

Shortly after this Damiani resolved on abdicating his bishopric and retiring back to his beloved cloister, from which he had

been with such difficulty separated. Here it is that we think Mr. Bowden is rather hard upon him, unless, as is certainly possible, he has reasons which do not appear in his volumes. He calls him "singularly-minded," and he speaks of "his morbid craving after ascetic retirement." Now surely there is nothing strange in his desiring quiet, and, as to whether he ought to have indulged that desire, that is a question which no one could determine but himself. Supposing he found himself falling back in self-control and divine love, would not that be a reason for doubt and deliberation what it was his duty to do? Gibbon speaks ironically of unwilling monks being torn out of their retreats and seated on bishops' thrones, but no one can know but themselves how great a blessing the cloister is, and what a great sacrifice to relinquish it. The ten thousand trivial accidents of the day in a secular life which exert a troublous influence upon the soul, dimming its fair surface with many a spot of dust and damp, these give place to a divine stillness, which, to those who can bear it, is the nearest approach to heaven. A sharp word, or a light remark, or a tone, or an expression of countenance, or a report, or an unwelcome face, or an association, ruffles the mind and keeps it from fixing itself upon its true good. "One day," says St. Gregory when Pope, "when I was oppressed with the excessive trouble of secular affairs, I sought a retired place, friendly to grief, where whatever displeased me of my engagements, might show itself openly, and all that was accustomed to inflict pain might be seen at one view." While he was there "his most dear son Peter the deacon," who had been his intimate from the time that the latter was a young man, surprised him. He opens his grief to Peter in words which are so much to our purpose, that with the reader's indulgence we will digress to quote them. "My sad mind," he says, "labouring under the soreness of its engagements, remembers how it went with me formerly in my monastery, how all perishable things were beneath it, how it was superior to all that was transitory; that it was wont to think of nought but things of heaven; that though still in the body, it went out beyond the very prison of the flesh in con-

temptation : that it even loved death, which is to nearly all a punishment, as the entrance of life and the reward of its labour. But now, in consequence of the pastoral charge, it undergoes the business of secular men, and for that fair beauty of its quiet, is dishonoured with the dust of earthly work. And after dissipating itself on outward things, to serve the many, even when it seeks what is inward, it comes home indeed, but is no more equal to itself."—*Dial.* i. 1. Such would be the bitter experience of a mind like Damiani's ; and it depends on a number of minute circumstances whether it was not as much his duty to decline the pastoral charge as Gregory's to retain it. Mr. Bowden allows, too, that "from his retirement he continued to watch with an attentive eye the fortunes of the Church ; by his epistles he still interfered with her concerns and influenced her destiny, nor was he backward when called on to devote himself on special occasions to active services in her cause." And we find in the after history, of his going, in his extreme age, as Alexander's legate, to the young King Henry, and preventing him from the scandalous step of divorcing an innocent wife, against whom he had no charge but that he did not like her. Mr. Bowden notices, however, that Hildebrand never forgave his retirement at a time when the Church had such need of his services in his episcopate ; and he adds his own suspicion that some feelings towards Hildebrand akin to jealousy influenced him in retiring from his post.

Another personage who must not be passed without notice is the Empress Agnes, the wife of Henry III., the reforming emperor, and the mother of the prince of the same name, with whom, as we shall hereafter see, Hildebrand, as Pope, came into collision. Her husband dying young, she was appointed regent to her young son, and was led, from the political circumstances in which she found herself, to place herself in opposition to the papal party, who had elected Alexander II. Pope, without waiting for the emperor's concurrence, on the plea of his being a minor. Agnes in consequence had, by means of a German council, appointed in his place Cadalous, Bishop of Parma, who, coming to Rome, posted himself in St. Angelo, which belonged

to a family of the name of Cencius, and for some years harassed the Pope in possession. Afterwards she underwent severe affliction ; her son was stolen from her, and put into the hands of persons who corrupted him. The consequence is related in the following passage :—

“The Empress Agnes, when bereft of her son, had entertained, as we have seen, in the first moments of her anguish, the thought of devoting herself to a life of religious seclusion. Though she had been subsequently recalled to the court, and to her son’s society, under the auspices of Adelbert, it was not to resume the commanding part which she had formerly played there, but to be treated with empty honours, while she beheld the unhappy youth guided, in courses which she deprecated, by counsellors whom she had no power to control. She continued, therefore, a mourner ; and her sorrows strengthened and confirmed the devotional tendency of her mind. Earthly expectations fading before her, she learned to lean more steadfastly on hopes from above. Her friend and adviser, the Bishop of Augsburg, having died, she listened with pleasure to the ghostly counsels conveyed to her in the epistles addressed to her by Peter Damiani. Under this training, she learned to view the course of her late policy with altered eyes, and to mourn over the part which she had taken in the election of Cadalous, as over a grievous sin. And, after Adelbert’s overthrow had once more put her son into the hands of those who had originally stolen him from her, she resolved on abandoning alike the name of earthly dignity, and the country in which that dignity had been enjoyed ; and on spending the remainder of her days in repentance and devotion, at the threshold of St. Peter. Wonderful, according to Damiani, and edifying, was the spectacle of her entrance into the apostolic city. She rode, not on a stately palfry, but on a short and sorry steed, scarcely exceeding the size of an ass : the robe had been changed for the veil, the purple for the sackcloth ; and the hand which had wielded the sceptre was worn by the constant use of the Psalter. Arrived in Rome, she humbled herself before the pontiff, whose title she had disputed ; she sought and received his absolution ; and then devoted herself to religious seclusion, in the convent of St. Petronilla, in the papal city.”—Vol. i. pp. 256, 257.

In these extracts much has incidentally been shown of the nature of the struggle which was in progress, and the results to which it was approximating. The most important of these was

that above referred to in the history of Agnes. A decree of a Lateran Council had been passed under Nicholas II. in 1059, vesting the election of Pope in the College of Cardinals, with the concurrence and ratification of the emperor; a decree which was more than acted upon on the election of Alexander, which next followed. The imperial court resisted the appointment, and named an antipope; but the contest was terminated in favour of the Papalists in 1067, at a council held in Mantua, in which the emperor gave up Cadalous and acknowledged Alexander II. Six years afterwards Alexander died. Hildebrand had already on a former occasion been put forward for the papal chair, but he had resisted the proposal, it is said, "with many tears and supplications"; now, however, the following scene took place:—

"Alexander II. had no sooner breathed his last than his archdeacon, in concert with the other leading ecclesiastics of the city, directed that the three following days should be devoted to fasting, to deeds of charity, and to prayer; after which the proper authorities were to proceed—in the hope of the divine blessing upon their counsels—to the election of a successor. But, long before the period thus prescribed had elapsed, that election was decided.

"On the day following that of Alexander's decease, the dignified clergy of the Roman Church stood, with the archdeacon, round the bier of the departed pontiff, in the patriarchal church of the Lateran. The funeral rites were in progress, and Hildebrand, it is probable, was taking a part in the celebration of these solemn ceremonies. But suddenly, from the body of the building, which had been filled to overflowing by the lower clergy and people, burst forth the cry of 'Hildebrand.' A thousand voices instantly swelled the sound 'Hildebrand shall be Pope.' 'St. Peter chooses our Archdeacon Hildebrand.' These, and cries like these, rang wildly along the church; the ceremonies were interrupted, and the officiating clergy paused in suspense. The subject of this tumult, recovering from a momentary stupor, rushed into a pulpit, and thence, while his gestures implored silence, attempted to address the agitated assembly. But the attempt was vain; the uproar continued, and it was not until they perceived the cardinal presbyter, Hugo Candidus, coming forward and soliciting their attention, that the multitude suffered their cries to subside.

“ ‘Brethren,’ said the cardinal, ‘ye know, and, as it appears, ye acknowledge, that, from the time of our Holy Father Leo, Hildebrand, our archdeacon, has proved himself a man of discretion and probity; that he has exalted the dignity of our Roman Church, and rescued our Roman city from imminent dangers. We can find no man more fitting to be entrusted with the future defence of our Church or state; and we, the cardinal bishops, do, with one voice, elect Hildebrand to be henceforth your spiritual pastor and our own.’

“The joyous cries of the populace arose anew. The cardinal bishops and clergy approached the object of their choice to lead him toward the apostolic throne. ‘We choose,’ they cried to the people, ‘for our pastor and pontiff, a devout man; a man skilled in interpreting the Scriptures; a distinguished lover of equity and justice; a man firm in adversity, and temperate in prosperity; a man, according to the saying of the Apostle, of good behaviour, blameless, modest, sober, chaste, given to hospitality, and one that ruleth well in his own house. A man from his childhood generously brought up in the bosom of this mother Church, and for the merit of his life already raised to the archidiaconal dignity. We choose, namely, our archdeacon, Hildebrand, to be Pope and successor to the Apostle, and to bear henceforward and for ever the name of Gregory.’ The Pope elect, upon this, was forthwith invested by eager hands with the scarlet robe and tiara of pontifical dignity, and placed, notwithstanding his gestures of reluctance, and even his tears, upon the throne of the Apostle. The cardinals approached him with obeisance, and the people, with shouts yet louder and more joyous than before, repeated the designation of their new pontiff, and tumultuously testified their approbation.”—Vol. i. pp. 314-317.

Considering the unparalleled character, or, as we may say, the madness of the plans to which Hildebrand was pledged, and which his spirit within him told him he must attempt at all risks, it is not wonderful at all that he should both have shrunk from the pontificate beforehand, and have been overcome with the burden when first put upon him. Power or wealth is pleasant to us when unattended with conditions; but did they involve the necessity of risking limbs, or resigning friends, they would lose much of their attraction and many of their aspirants. Now Hildebrand was thus circumstanced: while he was a subordinate he might promote plans of others, though short of the best and

largest ; but when "a dispensation of the Gospel" was committed to him, "necessity was laid on him" to go through all and leave nothing undone.

"The event of his election, unexpected as, at the moment, it unquestionably was, seems to have overwhelmed for a while even his intrepid spirit. In letters written from the couch on which, exhausted in mind and body, he passed the following day, he speaks of it in terms of terror, and, using the poetical language of the Psalms, exclaims, 'I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me. I am weary of my crying: my throat is dried. Fearfulness and trembling are come upon me, and horror hath overwhelmed me.' And he concludes by anxiously imploring the intercessions of his friends with Heaven in his behalf; expressing a hope that their prayers, though they had not sufficed to prevent his being called to that post of danger, might yet avail to defend him when placed there.

"The greatness, and—in the actual state of the world—the daring nature, of the desires which animated him, and those with whom he had for some time been acting, now stood, perhaps, more fully displayed before him than ever, at the moment in which he felt himself irrevocably pledged to be the leading instrument in their fulfilment. His election called him to occupy the foremost post in the great conflict of principle then pending; a conflict, on his part, against long-rooted customs, against long-established authority; a conflict against the wishes, the prejudices, and even, in some respects, the affections natural to mankind; a conflict in which to fail was ruin and disgrace; from which to retire would be a sinful abandonment of duty. An irresistible necessity, as it would appear to him, suddenly brought him close to those gigantic events,—those fearful moments of crisis, which he had till then been permitted to contemplate through the mists of a comparatively dim and distant futurity; and his spirit may well have shrunk, for a moment, from more nearly and more directly contemplating them."—Vol. i. pp. 318, 319.

He wrote a letter shortly after his elevation to Lanfranc, to whom he unbosomed himself more entirely than to others, and from this Mr. Bowden gives us some extracts. "The greater," he says, "the peril in which we are placed, the greater our need of the prayers of all good men. For we, if we would escape the sentence of the divine wrath, must arise against many, and must

incense them against our own soul. And thy prudence will alike see, how fearful it must be for us to abstain from opposing such persons, and how difficult for us to oppose them." Such were his feelings, and that they were replete with faith and conscientiousness there can be no doubt, or that he viewed the course which lay before him with awe. But now what was it which he thus contemplated as his destined trial? The first that shall be mentioned was no less than this: the obliging the clergy and their wives to separate, or to retire from their preferments, on the ground that clerical marriage was against the rule of the Church. Now this subject requires some explanation.

We have already noticed that simony and licentiousness were the two crying sins of the clergy; nor did their practice of taking wives at all diminish the latter. Rather it led to it; for since they knew that in marriage they were transgressing their duty, they were easily led on, from the recklessness which follows upon the wilful violation of conscience in any matter, from a first sin to a second. The prohibitory rule was one of long standing, and Mr. Bowden, waving the discussion into its abstract propriety, has drawn up a succinct account of it from the time of Pope Nicholas I. to the date of Hildebrand, a period of two hundred years. Direct condemnations of the practice are found in Nicholas's reply to the Bulgarians, 860; in the Synod of Worms, 868; in Leo VII.'s epistle to the Gauls and Germans, 938; in the decrees of Augsburg, 952; and in Benedict VIII.'s speech, and the decrees passed at Pavia about 1020. Hicmar of Rheims in 845, Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz in 750, councils at Mentz and Metz in 888, and at Nantes at the end of the same century, had confirmed the rule with additional circumstances of strictness. And the association in the case of the clergy between marriage and concubinage, or general profligacy, were unhappily so deeply seated, that neither did it occur to the reformers to question their necessary connection; nor, had they done so, could they have overcome the popular feeling on the subject. Under the circumstances, as Mr. Bowden observes, "The battle which they" undertook against their less strict contemporaries, was unquestionably that of

purity against impurity, that of holiness against corruption. Seizing the means in their power, they set themselves to achieve, and did achieve, a most important reformation; and we may not think lightly, either of their principles or of their labours, because that reformation was imperfect."

We have already stated what Gregory's proceeding was, and it was carried into effect under circumstances as shocking as the resolve was ruthless. With a single and severe determination, putting before him the honour of Christ, and the welfare of the Church, like Ezra, the great Reformer of Judah, he "said to his father and to his mother, I have not seen him; neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew his own children." Ezra learned, to his deep dismay, that his people had taken to themselves wives of the heathen; "so that the holy seed had mingled themselves with the people of those lands, yea, the hand of the princes and rulers had been chief in this trespass." Upon this, he tells us that he rent his garments and mantle, and plucked off the hair of his head and of his beard, and sat down astonished. So he sat till the evening sacrifice; when he arose from his heaviness, deliberately rent his garment and mantle, fell on his knees, spread out his hands towards heaven, and confessed the sin of his people, and interceded for their forgiveness. One thing only could be done, and Shechaniah, the son of Jehiel, exhorted him to it: to make the people "put away all the wives, and such as were born of them;" and he added, "Arise, for this matter belongeth unto *thee*; we also will be with thee; be of good courage and do it." Such a voice seemed to sound in Gregory's ears; and, in the strength of a pure conscience, he bade those of his brethren, who against their conscience had taken wives, make the only reparation which could be made by them for their sin.

But it was not so easy to accomplish as to command; he had, as might be supposed, an opposition to encounter, to which no nerve but his could have been equal.

"Vehement was the indignation of the German clergy, when first the intelligence of this obnoxious enactment reached their ears, and

when they found that the great moral power, which the papacy had within the last few years attained, was to be wielded in enforcing, as realities, those principles of austere reformation, which, when promulgated as they had been by Gregory's predecessors, a few years before, had probably seemed like theoretical notions, based upon views unsuited to the state of things actually existing in the world. The Pope, the clergy exclaimed aloud, was a heretic, and his decree that of a mad man. The execution of it was a childish, an impossible notion. Human nature being what it was, the rigour of his laws,—the attempt to make men live like angels, would only plunge the clergy, by a necessary reaction, into habits more dissolute than ever. And the letter of holy Scripture—the plain teaching as well of our Lord himself, as of his inspired Apostle, was directly at variance with this wild, this extravagant enactment. But they defied him to proceed to such an extremity as to enforce its general adoption; and protested that, sooner than resign their domestic enjoyments, they would relinquish the priesthood; and when he had expelled them, for no other reason than that they were men, he might seek where he could for angels, to minister in the churches in their stead.

“And long, and violently, did this tumult rage. Several bishops, among whom was Otho, of Constance, openly put themselves at the head of the clergy opposed to Gregory's authority. And prelates, who, taking a different course, attempted to promulgate the papal edict in their respective dioceses, were assailed by the refractory members of their churches with insolence and outrage. But Gregory, ever watchful of their proceedings, prevented their zeal from flagging by repeated messages of warning, exhortation, and encouragement. And most especially was he urgent with Siegfried, to assume, on the occasion, the determined tone which became him, as primate of Germany, and to enforce the observance of the mandates of the Church, with the full weight of his authority.”—Vol. ii. pp. 20-22.

Siegfried was a most unworthy successor of St. Boniface. He had at an early date committed himself to an attempt to introduce a tithe payment among the Thuringians, which he prosecuted at all seasons, with a pertinacity not at all inferior to that of the worthy Trapbois, for his miserable piece of gold. With the hope of effecting this, through the royal power, he had even consented to advocate the project of the royal divorce,

and summoned a council for that purpose in his metropolitan city; when Damiani appeared as the pope's legate and stopped the infamous proceeding, as was mentioned above. The year following he was summoned by Alexander II. to Rome, to defend himself against a charge of simoniacal practices. Roused to a momentary remorse by the remonstrance of the pope, he expressed a wish to resign his station, and retire to a life of penitence and seclusion. This proposal, however, was strenuously resisted by Alexander and others, and he returned to Germany, to lose his serious thoughts, and to relapse into his former secularity. At the present crisis, he gave his clergy six months to deliberate on Gregory's injunction, and then summoned a council, in which he bade them renounce either their wives or those offices which they had accepted on the condition of celibacy. The clergy, after hearing his address, quitted the place of assembly, as if for the purpose of private deliberation, and then resolved at once to set out for home, without his leave. Siegfried, however, pacified them and persuaded them to return, with the promise that he would send to Rome to solicit a relaxation of the enactment; but no sooner had he effected this, than the very next day he brought forward instead, before a mixed assembly of clergy and laity, the old question of his pretensions to the Thuringian tithes, which had already been settled by treaty in favour of the Thuringians. A tumult ensued; the council was broken up in confusion, the archbishop with difficulty escaped with his life, and betaking himself to Heiligenstadt, he continued there during the remainder of the year, repeating, but in vain, on every festival, his summons to the disturbers of the council to do penance for the crime, under pain of excommunication.

But Gregory had a new and formidable and, we must add, unjustifiable weapon, which he now brought into the contest. The measure which he was enforcing was founded on four canons lately passed at Rome in council, the fourth of which was to the effect that the laity should refuse the ministrations both of simoniacal and of married or licentious clergy. This canon seemed to oppose the advice of Nicholas I. to the newly

converted Bulgarians, who, on asking whether they should receive and honour married priests, had received for answer that such priests might be in themselves fit subjects of censure, but it was not for them as laymen to pronounce a censure which lay with their bishops only. Gregory, however, seems to have understood that that aversion to a married priesthood, which he felt himself, was shared largely by the multitude, especially as they saw marriage commonly associated with general laxity of life. Another feeling which he had on his side was of a far less defensible character—the opposition to authority, and especially ecclesiastical authority, which is natural to the mind. He urged then the canon upon the Germans, and the consequences were horrible:—

“By the last of the four canons above quoted, the laity were thrown into the position,—if not of judges of the priesthood,—at least of punishers of its irregularities. And such invitation, thus made, was of course readily and generally attended to. The occasion seemed—to the selfish, the irreverent, and the profane—to legalise the gratification of all the bad feelings, with which persons of those dispositions must ever regard the Church and her ministry; and priests, whose disobedience to the papal authority furnished any excuse for such conduct, were openly beaten, abused, and insulted by their rebellious flocks. Some were forced to fly with the loss of all that they possessed, some were deprived of limbs, and some, it is even said, put to death in lingering torments. And to lengths even more horrible than these did the popular violence, thus unhappily, thus criminally sanctioned, proceed. Too many were delighted to find what they could consider a religious excuse for neglecting religion itself, for depriving their children of the inestimable gift conferred in the holy sacrament of baptism, or for making the solemn mysteries of the Church subjects for the most degrading mockery, or of the most atrocious profanation. Deeply is it to be regretted that a pontiff who desired, from the bottom of his heart, the purification of the Church; whose whole life had been devoted to that high and holy cause; and who unquestionably would have shrunk, in the abstract, from the idea of supporting that cause by any means inconsistent with the maintenance of a proper discipline in the Church; should have evoked, in furtherance of his views, a spirit of so odious a character, as was that which showed itself in these

dreadful transactions. But such had been the line marked out for him by those who had gone before him; and it accorded but too well with the general structure of the great theological system under which he lived; a system great and glorious in its general features,—on which, indeed, it yet bore the unquestioned impress of divinity; but which, blighted and distorted as it had been by its human modifications, only showed, when contemplated under partial or particular lights, the extent of its deviation from its original model, and the foulness of its consequent corruptions.”—Vol. ii. pp. 25-27.

In France the promulgation of Gregory's canons was received by the clergy with a burst of indignation yet more vehement, if possible, than that which had followed them in Germany. A council of Paris denounced them, and the only member of the assembly who ventured to defend them was seized, beaten, spit upon, and tumultuously dragged to prison. When the Archbishop of Rouen endeavoured to enforce them upon his clergy, he was pelted with stones and fled for his life. Mr. Bowden tells us that the system of clerical marriage had been so completely established in Normandy, that churches had become property heritable by the sons, and even by the daughters, of their possessors. This fact shows how the two canonical offences of clerical marriage and simony ran together. Indeed it seems that the French king, breaking a promise he had made to Gregory, was practising a simoniacal traffic in bishops and abbeyes without remorse or shame; while the holders of dignities thus obtained were not likely to be more scrupulous in their turn, in their nomination to such inferior benefices and offices as thus fell under their control. In Spain, again, the papal legate was assailed by the clergy with menaces and outrages, when he attempted to enforce the observance of celibacy upon them. When the ill-treated parties complained to Gregory, they got some such consolation as the following: “Shall it not shame us,” he asks, “while every soldier of the world daily hazards his life for his sovereign, if we, priests of the Lord, shrink from the battle of our King, who made all things out of nothing, who scrupled not to lay down His life for us, and who has promised us eternal rewards?” In Hungary, twenty years

later, the rule had not made greater way than this, that a council under Ladislaus prohibited second marriages among the clergy, but allowed to married presbyters a time of indulgence, "on account of the bond of peace and the unity of the Holy Ghost, until the paternal authority of the apostolic see should have been consulted on the subject." England, ruled at this time by the Conqueror, Gregory did not attempt; with that judgment and discrimination which he united to vigour, he waited for the influence of the precedent which he was introducing elsewhere. Yet even a few years after this the council of Winchester enacted that no married persons should be admitted into orders, though it passed a decree that parish priests who had wives already might retain them; which showed what already was the silent and indirect effect of Gregory's energetic proceedings in the Empire. Eventually, the Anglican Church gave its adhesion to the principle of clerical celibacy even more completely than the Church of France.

But at the time Gregory seemed to have success in no quarter, and not the least vexatious opposition was offered him in his own city. Guibert, who had in the time of Alexander been the Imperial Chancellor of Italy, and the supporter of the intruder Cadalous, was at this time Archbishop of Ravenna, having been appointed by the mediation of the Empress Agnes, just at the close of Alexander's life. Alexander himself had seen through the insincerity of his professed repentance, and was reluctant to consecrate him; but Hildebrand, it is said, trusted him and pleaded for him. Upon this, Alexander, with a prescient spirit, said, "I indeed am about to be dissolved; the time of my departure is at hand; but thou shalt feel his bitterness." The prophecy was not long in finding its fulfilment, and he eventually became anti-pope in Gregory's later years.

"He put himself at the head of that party in Rome who were either alarmed at Gregory's rigour, or conceived themselves aggrieved by his measures of reform; attaching to himself the relatives and friends of the married clergy, as well as those many members of the sacerdotal body who had resigned their benefices in preference to adopting a life of celibacy. And there were other classes whose habits and imagined

interests had been, by the reforming pontiff, violently interfered with. To the Church of St. Peter belonged more than sixty officers of the class called 'Mansionarii.' They were married laymen, many of dissolute habits; and it was their custom,—such had been the disgraceful laxity of the times,—mitred and dressed in sacerdotal robes, to keep constant watch at all the altars of the church, excepting only the high altar itself, to proffer, as priests, their services to the simple laity, who came from distant parts of Italy, and to receive their oblations. Relieving each other, they occupied the church day and night, and, as though not content with the blasphemous profanations now mentioned, disgraced the holy place during the hours of darkness by robberies and licentiousness of the most infamous kind. Nor was it without great difficulty that Gregory, even in his own city, could put an end to this crying abuse, and replace, at the altars, these impious laymen by priests canonically ordained. The cardinals themselves were wont, in the same church, to disgrace their office by celebrating the Holy Eucharist at irregular hours for the sake of gain; and Gregory's interference, to put a stop to this abuse by wholesome regulations, is described as having excited against him much odium among certain classes of his flock."—Vol. ii. pp. 42, 43.

Gregory was at this time about sixty years of age, and tried by cares and by a life of rigid mortification from his boyhood, he gave way in health, and it was thought that he was dying. He recovered, however; a circumstance, he says himself, "rather for sorrow than for joy. For our soul was tending towards, and with all desire panting for, that country, where He, who observes our labour and our sorrow, prepares for the weary refreshment and repose. But we were yet reserved to our accustomed toils, our infinite anxieties; reserved to suffer, as it were, each hour the pangs of travail, while we feel ourselves unable to save, by any steersmanship, the Church which seems almost foundering before our eyes."

Well might Gregory say that he was reserved for something, for he had not yet reached his celebrated struggle with Henry, which Fox the martyrologist, if no one else, has made familiar to Protestant ears, and which is the last and longest passage of his history which we propose to trace.

In 1074 he had waged his battle with the clergy; that was enough for one year; but in the very next spring he opened his assault upon the emperor. No wonder a mind of such incessant energy should complain of nothing but weariness and disappointment; and this seems to have been the habitual feeling under which he went to his work. "Often," he says, "at this point of time, have I implored the Lord either to remove me from this present life, or to benefit, through me, our common Mother; and yet has He not hitherto removed me from tribulation, nor, as I had hoped, made my life profitable to her in whose chains He has bound me. Vast is the grief, wide-spreading the affliction, which encompasses me. Contemplating east, south, north, I perceive scarcely any bishops lawfully admitted to their office, and leading lives conformable to their sacred character. Nor do I find among the secular princes any who prefer God's honour to their own, or righteousness to gain. Those nations among whom I dwell, the Romans, Lombards, and Normans, I conceive, as I often declare to them, to be in some sense worse than Jews or Pagans. And turning inwards, I find myself so laden with the burden of my own doings, that no hope of salvation remains to me but in the sole mercy of Christ. Did I not trust to attain to a better life and to do service to Holy Church, I would on no account remain in Rome; in which city it has been by compulsion, God is my witness, that I have dwelt these twenty years. Whence it comes to pass, that, between this grief daily renewed to me, and the hope which, alas, is too long deferred, I live as it were in death, shaken by a thousand storms. And I await His coming who has bound me with His chains, led me back to Rome against my will, and girt me round with countless difficulties." Such were the feelings under which he got ready for his great exploit.

It is hardly to our purpose to go into the Pope's quarrel with the emperor in its early stages; it turned principally on Henry's profligate life, his simoniacal appointments, and his cruelties and perfidies towards his subjects. Besides this the Pope claimed the right of investiture, feeling that from its very form it was undeniably of an ecclesiastical, not a secular nature; that when

exercised by laymen, it was necessarily connected with simony, and involved the principle that the Church was the creature of the State. We will but say that Alexander, at a council held about two months before his death, had excommunicated five of Henry's profligate favourites, and had even, as some say, sent a message to Henry himself, to appear before the chair of St. Peter and defend himself against the charge of simony and other offences. On Gregory's accession, the new Pope made friendly overtures to him, and the young king, being in great difficulties with his subjects, accepted them with much profession of humility and repentance. "Smitten in some degree, through God's mercy, with compunction," he said, "and returning to ourselves, we confess our past transgressions and throw ourselves on your paternal indulgence, hoping in the Lord to obtain the boon of absolution from your apostolical authority. Criminal we have been, and unhappy, partly through the alluring instincts of youth, partly through the licence of unbridled power, partly through the seductive guidances of others. We have not only invaded the property of the churches, but have sold to persons infected with the gall of simony the churches themselves; but now, unable without your authority to reform the abuses of the churches, we implore alike your counsel and your aid, in this as in all things. Your command is, in all things, of authority." Subsequently to this, Henry's mother, sent by Gregory, undertook a journey to him with the papal legate; he complied with their demands, made open profession of his simony and other offences, assisted them in degrading the simoniacal bishops, and received absolution at their hands. But, shortly afterwards, his fortunes taking a favourable turn, he was released from the necessity of keeping terms with the Pope; and recalling the excommunicated nobles to his court, he provided for himself counsellors whose personal feelings would encourage him in courses directly opposed to the wishes and the principles of Gregory. His tone and conduct, in consequence, underwent an entire change. He appointed bishops to the churches of Fermo and Spoleto without consulting Gregory, and, in spite of his promise, to Milan; and the preponderance which he thus gave to the anti-

papal party in northern Italy, was extended by Guibert of Ravenna into the south by a correspondence with Robert Guiscard, who happened at this time to be under papal ban. On the other hand, the Saxons who had been cruelly oppressed by Henry, had risen in arms and been reduced, appealed to Gregory for protection for their bishops, whom Henry had perfidiously seized, deposed, plundered, and imprisoned; and Gregory, answering to their appeal, took the strong step of not only demanding the liberation of the bishops, but, as Alexander is said to have done before him, of summoning Henry himself to appear before the apostolic tribunal, to clear himself of the charges which had been brought against him.

“All things are double, one against another.” Every power, every form of government, every influence, strong as it may be, has its natural remedy or match, by which it is prevented from doing all things at its will. In constitutional governments they appeal to the law; in absolute monarchies they rise; in military despotisms they assassinate. James the Second is opposed by forms of law; Louis of France by jaqueries; Paul of Russia is strangled. And then the one antagonist which from the beginning has been opposed to the spiritual weapons of the Church, is no other than that very intellectual power, material force, “the logic of kings.” So it was on this occasion. Guibert of Ravenna has the reputation of being concocter of a plot, with the privity of Henry and Robert Guiscard, which developed itself as follows:—Cencius was the instrument of it, a bold and profligate man, being a member of the powerful family which was in possession of the castle of St. Angelo, and had been the main support of the anti-pope Cadalous in his struggle with Alexander.

“The night of Christmas Eve, 1075, was gloomy and tempestuous; the torrents of rain, according to Paul of Bernried, were such as to present a lively image of the general deluge; and although Gregory, according to custom, celebrated the Holy Eucharist at midnight, in the church of Sta. Maria Maggiore, the building, instead of being as usual thronged with worshippers, was comparatively silent and deserted; few venturing to leave their homes in weather so inclement.

“Gregory and his clergy had partaken of the holy elements, and were engaged in distributing them to the laity, when, on a sudden, Cencius and his confederates burst in arms into the church. Interrupting the holy ceremonial, they seized the pontiff at the altar; one of the ruffians, aiming a blow with a sword at his head, inflicted a serious wound on his forehead; and the rest then dragged him, amid insults and blows, from the precincts of the sanctuary. He preserved a perfect composure, lifting up his eyes to heaven, but neither struggling nor speaking, while these abandoned wretches thus vented on him their fury. They stripped him of his pallium and chasuble, and then binding him—still clad in his alb and stole—behind a ruffian on horseback, they hurried him to one of the towers, already mentioned, of Cencius, where preparations had been made for bearing him at once beyond the walls of Rome. But this latter part of their project the conspirators were not able to succeed in accomplishing. Clamours, even louder than the now abating storm, soon rang through the awakened city. For a time the populace was agitated by a distracted uncertainty respecting their pastor’s fate. An anxious search was made for him in all directions, and the gates of Rome were occupied by soldiery, to prevent his being carried, by any contrivance, beyond them. But, at length, the throngs assembled on the Capitoline Hill were informed of the place of his confinement. On the instant, they rushed, with wild and dissonant cries, toward the tower of Cencius, driving before them those by whom their progress was opposed. And the first glimpse of dawn showed, to the conspirators within it, their enemies, provided with ladders, catapults, and every species of engine then used in assaults, and preparing for an immediate and vigorous attack.

“A man attached to Gregory, and a noble matron of Rome, had contrived to follow the pontiff to the scene of his imprisonment, and there did all in their power to alleviate his sufferings; the former warming his numb and frozen feet by chafing them with fur, and the latter endeavouring, by the best means in her power, to dress his bleeding wound. But in these pious cares they were interrupted by the sister of Cencius, who, abandoned as her brother, reviled the illustrious prisoner in the most violent terms; while one of her partisans, drawing a sword, threatened to strike off, on the instant, his head. But the scene was now to change. A lance, or dart, from without, pierced this wretch’s throat, and laid him breathless on the ground. The walls of the tower began to totter before the machines of the assailants, and Cencius, foiled and confounded, felt that he had no

resource remaining but to throw himself before his august prisoner, and to pray for life and pardon. Throughout this scene of confusion and danger Gregory preserved the dignity of his character. 'Thy injuries against myself,' he said, 'I forgive, but those against our Lord, His Mother, His Apostles, and His whole Church demand an expiation. Go, in the first place, on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; and then, if thou mayest return alive, present thyself among us, such in act and thought, as thou mayest, in some way, obtain the grace of reconciliation from Almighty God. And as thou hast been hitherto, to all sons of the Church, an example of subversion, be one, for the future, of conversion.'

"The pontiff then, at the request of Cencius, approached a window, and, showing himself to the populace, he entreated them by signs to desist from the attack. But his gestures were unfortunately misunderstood, and the multitude imagined that their spiritual father was encouraging their efforts and imploring their speedy succour. The attack was, therefore, carried on with redoubled fury. The walls of the tower soon gave way before their exertions, and Gregory, borne in triumph from amid the ruins to the church from which he had been torn, there concluded the holy service in which he had been interrupted, amid the enthusiastic rejoicings of the people.

"Cencius, pursued by the execrations of his countrymen, with difficulty escaped from their fury, and fled, with his principal confederates, to Germany."—Vol. ii. pp. 81-85.

This attempt then failed—but the measures of Gregory proceeded. About the same time that Cencius was playing his part in Rome, the Pope's legates on their part appeared before Henry with his summons, warning him at the same time, that, did he not appear, a sentence of excommunication would issue against him. Henry dismissed them with ridicule and insult; and since force had failed, he resolved to attack their master with his own weapons, and summoned in haste a council of the German Church at Worms for Septuagesima Sunday, January 24th, with the view of obtaining from it the condemnation and deposition of Gregory. It was attended by a numerous assemblage of bishops and abbots; and when the session was opened, Hugo Candidus, who played so conspicuous a part in Gregory's election, and who had vacillated from side to side several times, stood forward as his accuser. He laid before

the council a variety of forged letters, purporting to come from various archbishops and bishops, and from the cardinals, senate, and people of Rome, filled with complaints of Gregory's conduct, and with entreaties for his expulsion from his see and the appointment of a successor. Then, as though in explanation of these epistles, Hugo read a document (which seems to have been subsequently the foundation of Benno's work) professing to give an account of Gregory's life, and filled with the most unfounded and incredible calumnies. It insisted on the baseness of his origin, and described his whole life, before and after his election, which was stated to have been simoniacal, as a tissue of crimes, among which were enumerated murder, necromancy, the profanation of the Holy Eucharist, and the worship of the devil. In consequence, after two days' consultation, without proposing even that Gregory should be heard in his defence, the council decreed, by its own local act, that he was no longer pope, and presented to each bishop the following formula for subscription:—"I, N., bishop of the city of N., abjure from this hour all subjection and obedience to Hildebrand, and will never more account or style him Pope." All the bishops present seem to have signed. Messengers were forthwith despatched into Lombardy with the news; the Lombard bishops met forthwith in council at Piacenza, and not only subscribed to the act of Worms, but bound themselves by a solemn oath upon the Gospels never more to recognise Gregory as pope, or to pay him obedience in that capacity. Roland, a priest of the Church of Parma, was charged with the perilous duty of bearing a copy of the acts of both councils to Rome, where he arrived in the second week in Lent, just when the council was assembled to which Henry had been summoned. Much as we have quoted from Mr. Bowden, we must here, as elsewhere, be allowed to prefer his vivid description to any words we could put together.

"The council being assembled, and the echoes of the solemn strain, 'Veni, Creator Spiritus,' having scarcely died away amid the holy aisles of the Lateran, Roland suddenly stepped forward before the pontiff and his prelate (p. 95). . . . Addressing his speech to Gregory, 'The

king,' he said, 'and the united bishops, as well of Germany as of Italy, transmit thee this command,—Descend without delay from the throne of St. Peter, and abandon the usurped government of the Roman Church, for to such honours should none aspire, unsanctioned by their general choice, and by the approval of the emperor.' And then, ere the assembled prelates and clergy had recovered from their astonishment, the audacious envoy looked round upon them, and thus addressed them collectively:—'To you, brethren, it is commanded, that you do, at the feast of Pentecost, present yourselves before the king, my master, to receive a Pope and a father from his hands. The pretended pastor before you is detected to be a ravening wolf.'

"'Seize him!' cried John, Bishop of Porto, a prelate of holy and exalted character, who could no longer contain his indignation. The prefect of the city rushed forward, attended by the guards and attendants of the council, swords were brandished, even in that holy place; and the blood of Ronald would, on the moment, have expiated his temerity, had not Gregory himself forced his way into the crowd, and restrained, though with difficulty, the fury of his adherents. Having at length succeeded in obtaining comparative tranquillity, the pontiff received from the prisoner the documents which he had been commissioned to deliver; and then, imploring the continued silence of the assembly, he proceeded to read aloud, with his usual composure, the acts of the councils of Worms and Piacenza, and the following extraordinary epistle:—

"'Henry, not by usurpation, but by the holy ordinance of God, king, to Hildebrand, no longer the Pope, but the false monk.

"'A greeting like this hast thou for thy confusion deserved; thou, who hast left no order of the Church untouched, but hast brought upon each confusion, not honour,—cursing, not blessing. To speak but of a few of thy most distinguished deeds,—the rulers of the holy Church, the archbishops, bishops, and presbyters, thou hast not only not feared, seeing that they are the Lord's anointed, to touch; but, as though they were servants who know not what their lord doeth, thou hast trampled them under thy feet. Thou hast obtained favour with the vulgar by their humiliation; and hast thought that they know nothing, and that thou alone knewest all things. Yet this knowledge of thine thou hast used for the purpose, not of edification, but of destruction, insomuch that we believe the blessed Gregory, whose name thou hast assumed, to have spoken prophetically of thee, when he said, "By the abundance of subjects, the mind of him who is set over them is puffed up, for he

supposes that he excels all in knowledge, when he finds that he excels all in power.””—Vol. ii. pp. 95-99.

We wish we had room to continue this most exciting scene, which ends in a majestic address of Gregory to the council ; however, we cannot refrain from giving the close of this speech, and the termination of the meeting.

“‘Now, therefore, brethren,’ he concluded, ‘it behoves us to draw forth the avenging sword. Now must we smite the enemy of God and of His Church, that the bruised head, now haughtily erect against the foundation of the faith, and of all the Churches, may recoil; that, according to the sentence pronounced against him in the first days of his pride, upon his belly he may go and eat the dust. “Fear not,” saith the Lord, “little flock; for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.” It is enough that ye have borne thus long with the adversary. Ye have warned him sufficiently and well. Now let him be made to feel that his conscience has been seared.’

“‘Here he paused, and appeared to wait the opinion of the prelates around him. But his suspense was not of long duration; the assembly, arising as one man, seemed eager to support him by the testimony of their unanimous approval. They called on him to wield, without delay, the high powers with which he was invested, and to pronounce the sentence of the Church against the blasphemer, the despoiler, the tyrant, the apostate. ‘Pronounce,’ they cried, ‘the doom, by which he may himself be crushed, and from which others, for ages to come, may take warning. Draw forth the sword!—inflict judgment!—let the righteous rejoice when he seeth the vengeance,—let him wash his footsteps in the blood of the ungodly.’”—Vol. ii. pp. 104, 105.

The next day, in the presence of 110 prelates and of the Empress Agnes, whose sense of duty overcame the affections of nature, he pronounced sentence in form upon the German and Lombard bishops, and above all upon Henry, whom he declared excommunicated from the Church and suspended from the enjoyment of his throne.

In these transactions, we see on both sides what we must account a confusion of the rights of Church and State; the emperor in council deposing the pope, and the pope deposing

the emperor. Mr. Bowden has some just remarks on the subject, and traces it to the feudalism of the day, which acknowledged but one standard of rank in the community, and forced all powers and offices to measure themselves by it. As in Russia, it is said, that men are only recognised as soldiers, and the clergy take rank as colonels or captains, so in the eleventh century Gregory was forced to place himself in direct relation to the emperor, and take precedence either above him or beneath him, and with this alternative he put himself above him, as the nearest approximation to the truth. And in like manner the emperor, not the present Henry only, but his father before him, and Conrad his grandfather, not to say the Carolingians, had placed themselves above the Church, because they were supreme in temporals and reduced all offices to a common class, just as a naturalist of this day in despair ranks a whale among the mammalia.

“The Christian doctrine, that the Almighty Head of the Church ‘ruleth over all the kingdoms of the earth, and giveth them to whomsoever he will,’ was confounded with the idea that His imagined sole vicar and representative below was invested with, what the language of the times entitled, a paramount lordship or suzerainty over the individual thrones of Christendom. Standing in the place of St. Peter, his successor was regarded as though clothed with an authority, similar in nature to that of kings, though exceeding theirs in extent; as occupying, in relation to them, a position analogous to that which they occupied in reference to their feudatory nobles; the great truth of the Church’s substantive and, in her own province, supreme authority, being thus borne witness to, though in connexion with the then generally prevalent error, which represented her as forming a certain definite member, a component necessary department of the system of feudal society.”—Vol. i. pp. 330, 331.

On the present occasion Mr. Bowden considers it a cause of thankfulness that Gregory, with all the incidental defects of his theological system, was in the chair of St. Peter. He considers that the success of the Imperialists would have been the immediate triumph of simony, licentiousness, and the other crying evils of the time, and would have tended to make that triumph

perpetual. On the other hand, Gregory was not only engaged in vindicating what he considered his divine authority, but an ecclesiastical principle essential to the independence and well-being of the Church. The real question was, Whether the Church was or was not a creature of the State? Whether she had or had not temporal rights was an excrescence upon the main question; and she needed a champion, such as, through God's providence, she found, who scorned either to be swayed by menaces, or to be bribed by the promise of a temporary peace, into the compromise of her essential principles.

Thus the contest opened. Gregory had on his side many of the leading nobles of Germany, the Saxons, to a certain extent the Swabians, the great mass of the regular and a considerable portion of the secular clergy. And Henry was supported by the Rhenish provinces, by the large towns, as Worms, now rising into some degree of commercial opulence, by a number of the nobility, who had felt or feared the papal censures, and the vast body of anti-reforming clergy. It was a moment of extreme excitement, when each of the contending parties had defied his antagonist, and waited to see how the defiance was received by Christendom at large, with whom eventually lay the decision.

As to Henry himself, however, he seems to have thought he had done everything when he had secured the synodal acts of Worms and Piacenza, as if they were to work their effect as a matter of course; he was astounded therefore at the intelligence that the old man whom he was resisting, far from crouching, had vigorously smitten him in turn with the ban of the Church. For a moment the unfortunate prince seemed overpowered with agitation; then he treated the subject with apparent indifference; then he gave orders that Gregory himself should be publicly excommunicated in turn. He committed this office to Pibo, Bishop of Toul; but Pibo, together with another bishop, set off in the night and left the king to go to the cathedral by himself, where the bishop of the place (Utrecht) pronounced the sentence. The next thing he heard was, that the German prelates, who had been denounced by Gregory

together with himself, were crossing the Alps to make their peace with him; next, the secular princes, who had the charge of the Saxon nobles and bishops, whom Henry had faithlessly seized, having been already shocked at the irreverence of Henry's proceedings in the Council of Worms, on hearing the papal sentence against him, let go their prisoners and sent them off to Saxony. On their arrival there, the Saxons rose in arms, appeared before the strongholds, which the king, in violation of his promise, had rebuilt in their country, took them by assault or capitulation, and then proceeded to resume the lands which had been seized by the royal favourites.

An event occurred which increased the dismay: William, Bishop of Utrecht, has been already mentioned as excommunicating Gregory in the cathedral. He repeated the sentence several times the same Easter, calling the Pope, perjured, an adulterer, and a false apostle. A month had not passed before he was seized with a violent illness, which carried him off in a few days. In his last moments he cried out that he had forfeited life both here and hereafter, and forbade his friends to pray for him after death as one destined to perdition. These facts were exaggerated; in addition, stories were circulated that, as he breathed his last sigh, his cathedral and his sovereign's palace were struck with lightning. Other deaths, too, in the king's party about the same time were interpreted by William's.

Henry appointed a diet at Worms for Whitsuntide; not one of his chief nobles attended. He postponed it to St. Peter's day, at Mentz; even then but a few obeyed the summons. Udo, the venerated Archbishop of Treves, had gone to Rome and received absolution. On his return, he refused to hold any intercourse with the Archbishops of Mentz and Cologne. Henry he would only approach for the purpose of counselling; he would not sit at table with him or join in prayer. The more religious members of the king's household withdrew themselves, and withstood Henry's most urgent entreaties to return.

Henry next led a force against the Saxons, and was repelled

with loss. At Gregory's suggestion, his principal nobles held a solemn diet of the empire at Worms in the autumn. It was very numerously attended; even Siegfried of Mentz obtained papal absolution and attended; the Patriarch of Aquileia and Bishop of Padua appeared as legates from the holy see. Henry sent the humblest messages to the diet in vain. At last they consented to treat with him on the terms that his continuing to reign should be referred to the Pope; that, until he could procure reconciliation, he should live as a private individual, neither entering church nor exercising any royal functions; that he should separate from all excommunicate persons; and that if at the end of a year his own excommunication was not reversed, his right to empire should be lost for ever. A council was appointed for the beginning of January, to meet at Augsburg, over which Gregory himself was to preside, and then Henry was to be reconciled. Henry wished to come to Italy, but Gregory forbade him. His anxiety for a release increased; he could not bear the suspense. Regardless, therefore, of Gregory's prohibition, of the season, which was unusually severe, and of the difficulty of crossing the Alps in the winter, he set out to find the Pope in Italy. Mr. Bowden shall set him forward on his journey:—

“The winter which closed the year 1076 was a season of unusual severity: the Rhine being frozen over from Martinmas almost to the beginning of April, 1077. The difficulties therefore of a journey across the Alps, at the time of Henry's expedition, must, under any circumstances, have been great; and the auspices under which the unfortunate monarch set forth were such as to render the undertaking in his case peculiarly arduous. Deprived of his friends and of his resources, it was not in his power to make any proper provision for the journey. Nor could he venture to prosecute his way along any of the more direct tracts which led from his German dominions into Italy; as Rudolf, Welf, and Berthold, who wished to retain him in Germany, sedulously watched the mountain passes of Swabia, Bavaria, and Carinthia. But Henry felt too strongly the danger of furnishing his enemies with any new pretext for setting him aside, to think of giving up the attempt, desperate as it might be, to procure a timely absolution.

“A few days, therefore, before the Christmas which closed the year 1076, the king put himself in motion from Spire. His wife and infant child accompanied his steps, and, whatever meaner followers may have formed his escort, it appears that only one person of gentle blood—and he not distinguished by rank or possessions—attended the fallen sovereign. The many princely and noble vassals who had thronged, in other days, his palace, now looked on him whom they had once courted and flattered, with hatred or contempt; nor was one of those whom he addressed on the subject found to return a favourable answer to his urgent entreaties for assistance on his journey. And the attached retainers and friends, with whom he had been compelled so recently to part, were now wandering across the different passes of the Alps, on errands similar to his own; prevented by dread, as well of the Pope as of the nobles, from making the journey in his company. He set forward however, and taking his way through Burgundy, halted to observe the festival of Christmas at Besançon. And thence, passing the Jura, he proceeded to Vevay on the shore of the lake of Geneva. . . . Even the valleys of the Alps, when Henry began to wind his way among them, were white with snow and slippery with ice. Peasants of the country, whose services he had hired, went before him, and cleared, as best they might, a precipitous and rugged road for the advance of the royal party. As the travellers ascended towards the higher regions of the pass, the difficulties of this process increased, of course, with every step. Happily, however, no serious accident occurred: and after long toils, the monarch and his little train found themselves on the summit of a ridge, a descent from which would lead them into Italy. But this descent appeared in prospect more formidable than anything which they had previously accomplished. The whole of the precipitous mountain-slope formed one sheet of ice, on which no foot, it seemed, could for a moment maintain its position. The descent, however, was necessarily attempted. Henry and the men of the party crawled carefully down on their hands and knees, placing their feet on whatever points of support they could find; and he, whose footing unfortunately failed him, rolled far away into the snowy depths below; from which it was often a matter of great difficulty to extricate him. The queen, her child, and her female attendants were, by the experienced peasants, lowered down the slope enveloped in skins of cattle; and the whole party reached at length the bottom in safety; though of their horses—which were either drawn down the descent with their legs tied together, or lowered on some rude kinds of machines

constructed for the purpose—many died, and many more were rendered unfit for further service. The party were, however, able to proceed with their journey; and Henry arrived, without further obstacle, in the plains of Lombardy.”—Vol. ii. pp. 161-164.

When the penitent arrived in Italy, it was at once spread abroad that he had come to take vengeance on the Pope. People recollected, or had been told, of Henry III.'s visitation of the papal see thirty years before, when a council was held at Sutri, and Gregory, the sixth of that name, was made to abdicate. Accordingly, nobles, prelates, and warriors thronged to greet him, and his crowded and brilliant court formed a strange contrast to the neglect, or rather aversion, which he had had to encounter on the other side the Alps. But Henry was not so dazzled with the scenes which now surrounded him to forget those which he had left. He asked where the Pope was, and finding he was at Canossa, a fortress of the Apennines belonging to the Countess Matilda (whither Gregory had taken refuge on the rumour of Henry's having come at the head of a formidable force), he betook himself thither.

While he is on his way thither, we must take the opportunity of commemorating Matilda, called the Great Countess. She inherited Tuscany from her mother, and was the enthusiastic friend and servant of Gregory; to him and to his principles her energies, influence, and treasures were dedicated. Her talents and learning were as remarkable as her rank and her devotion. Amid the various occupations which her extensive territories occasioned, she found time and opportunity to become the encourager, and, in some degree, the restorer, of ancient literature. She was acquainted with the more recent languages spoken in France and Germany, as well as in her own country. She was active and energetic in the enforcement of justice and the maintenance of her authority; nor was she unequal to the task of eliciting the military resources of her territory, and bringing well-disciplined armies into the field. She was munificently charitable to the poor; systematically kind and hospitable to the exile and to the stranger; and the foundress or benefactress

of a variety of churches or conventual institutions. Throughout her eventful life she never suffered secular matters to interfere with the frequency or regularity of her exercises of devotion ; and in adversity, of which she was allotted her share, she found her consolation in the society of holy men and the perusal of holy Scripture. "Such," says Mr. Bowden, "was the Great Countess ; such was she, who, too proud or too humble to recapitulate the roll of her titles, was wont to subscribe herself,— 'Matilda, by the grace of God what I am' ;" and at the present moment she was especially fitted to undertake the mediation between Gregory and Henry, being a relative of Henry as well as the host of Gregory.

"Towards Canossa, then, Henry bent his steps, accompanied by his recently-formed train of Italian followers. His faithful German adherents, who had, in the preceding month, set out to cross the Alps by different paths, had encountered on the journey a variety of difficulties and sufferings. Dietrich, Bishop of Verdun, was captured by Adelbert, Count of Calw, and plundered of the sums which he had, with much trouble, collected to meet the expenses of his journey. Rupert of Bamberg, being seized by Welf while traversing the Bavarian territory, was kept in strict ward from Christmas until the feast of St. Bartholomew in the following year. But the rest of Henry's excommunicated supporters, having surmounted the dangers of their journey, and made good their way into Italy, appeared before Canossa, while the king himself was yet on his way, and humbly presented themselves before the Pope as suppliants for his absolution. 'From those,' said Gregory, 'who rightly acknowledge and bewail their sin, forgiveness cannot be withheld. The petitioners must, however,' he continued, 'submit to the cauterising process which is needful for the healing of their wounds, that they may not, by too lightly obtaining absolution, be led too lightly to regard the sin which they have committed by disobedience to apostolical authority.' Prelates and lay-nobles alike professed their readiness to undergo whatever penance their spiritual father might think proper to impose ; and the former were, by his directions, confined in separate cells, with scanty supplies of food, while, to the latter, penances were assigned of a severity proportioned to the age and strength of each individual. And when he had thus tried them for several days, Gregory summoned them again before him, and after mildly rebuking them for their past conduct, and

admonishing them against such demeanour in future, declared them severally absolved, warning them at the same time, anxiously and repeatedly, against holding any communion with their imperial master, until he also should have given satisfaction to the apostolic see ; till that should happen, they were to be permitted to hold colloquy with him, only for the purpose of inducing him, by their persuasions, to abandon the error of his ways.

“At length the principal offender appeared in person before Canossa, and pitched his camp without the walls of the fortress.”—Vol. ii. pp. 167, 168.

The humiliation to which Gregory put the king himself has always been severely animadverted upon, and has done his character much harm with posterity ; but Mr. Bowden bids us recollect that severer penances were not at all uncommon at that time, and that it is very unfair to measure them by the standard of drawing-room propriety, and the judgment of an age of kid gloves and Naples soap. It was a most uncomfortable thing to be kept shivering in the cold from morning to night, and likely to cause rheumatism, of which we have no intention at all of speaking lightly ; but Henry III., the king's father, would habitually, before presenting himself in royal robes upon his throne, submit in private to a self-imposed scourging. The magnificent and luxurious Boniface of Tuscany, Matilda's father, submitted on one occasion to a similar discipline before the altar of St. Mary's at Pomposa, at the suggestion, if not at the hands, of his spiritual adviser, as a penance for some simoniacal transactions ; and Godfrey of Lorraine, Matilda's stepfather, in remorse for the burning of the cathedral of Verdun in the course of his warlike operations, not only contributed largely to its rebuilding, but caused himself to be scourged in public, and as publicly took part in the work of building, in the capacity of a common labourer. Such facts as these must be recollected when we read the following extraordinary scene :—

“It was on the morning of the 25th of January, 1077, while the frost reigned in all its intensity, and the ground was white with snow, that the dejected Henry, barefooted, and clad in the usual garb of penance,

a garment of white linen, ascended alone to the rocky fortress of Canossa, and entered its outer gate. The place was surrounded by three walls, within the two outer of which the imperial penitent was led, while the portals of the third or inner wall of the fortress were still closed against him. Here he stood, a miserable spectacle, exposed to cold and hunger throughout the day, vainly hoping, with each succeeding hour, that Gregory would consider his penance as sufficient, and his fault as atoned for. The evening, however, came, and he retired, humbled and dispirited, to return to his station with the returning light.

“On a second day, and on a third, the unhappy prince was still seen standing, starved and miserable, in the court of Canossa, from the morning until the evening. All in the castle, except the Pope, bewailed his condition, and with tears implored his forgiveness; it was said, even in Gregory’s presence, that his conduct was more like wanton tyranny than apostolic severity. But the austere pontiff continued obstinately deaf to all entreaties. At length, Henry’s patience failed him, and taking refuge in an adjacent chapel dedicated to St. Nicholas, he there besought, with tears, the intercession of the aged Abbot of Cluni; Matilda, who was present, seconded the king’s entreaty, but the abbot, turning to her, replied, ‘It is thou alone who canst undertake this business.’ And Henry, upon the word, fell upon his knees before his kinswoman, and besought her, in the most impassioned manner, once more to exert her potent intercession. She promised to use her utmost endeavours, and returned into the castle; and Gregory, feeling that he had now sufficiently vindicated his authority, relaxed at length his rigour, suffering the unfortunate king, still barefooted, and in his linen garment, to be brought into his presence on the fourth day of his penance.

“The scene, as the suppliant king approached the pontiff, must have been singularly striking. The youthful and vigorous Henry, of lofty stature and commanding features, thus humbling himself before the small, insignificant, and now probably withered figure of Gregory VII., must have afforded a striking type of that abasement of physical before moral power,—of the sword before the crosier,—which the great struggle then in progress was fated to accomplish.”—Vol. ii. pp. 174, 176.

Having brought our narrative to this critical point, we must break it off abruptly. What followed upon this, what an immediate

triumph to the Pope, what subsequent reverses, what eventual success after his day to his principles ; how Henry lapsed again, and how Gregory was at length forced to abandon Rome and died an exile at Salerno, for these and a multitude of interesting details we must refer the reader to the work itself which we are reviewing. As also for the account of the wonderfully large range of action which Gregory's labours embraced, and the multitude of Churches and States with which he had negotiation, among which were Constantinople, Hippo, Spain, England, Denmark, Russia, and Hungary. On two occasions, also, we find him directing the attention of the Church to the project of a crusade to the Holy Land, which was taken up in the next generation. But all this we must omit; and shall end this lengthened, but we hope not uninteresting narrative, with Mr. Bowden's account of Gregory's death :—

“ He moved, shortly after his final departure from Rome, to Salerno; where, under the efficient protection of Robert Guiscard, he was enabled to repose in security; and where, while he still kept a watchful eye upon the troublous scenes of the world around him, he sought a solace for its sorrows in assiduous devotion, and in continual meditation on the Word of God. As early as in January, 1085, he perceived symptoms of the exhaustion of his powers; the natural consequence of years, and of the arduous and unremitting labours and anxieties in which he had been so long engaged. During the succeeding months, his debility increased; and in May, it became evident to all around him, that, from the sick bed on which he was laid, he was doomed never to rise again. Aware of his approaching end, he summoned around him the cardinals and bishops, who, faithful to his cause, or rather to his principles, had attended him to Salerno. He spoke to them of the events of his past life; and, while he disclaimed any right to glory in anything which he had done, he acknowledged the satisfaction which he derived from the thought that his course had been guided by principle, by a zeal for the right, and by an abhorrence of evil. His auditors, plunged in sincere sorrow, expressed to him their melancholy anticipations of the fate of the Church, when deprived of his guiding hand. ‘But I,’ said he, with eyes and hands upraised to heaven, ‘am mounting thitherward; and with supplications the most fervent, will I commend your cause to the goodness of the Almighty.’

“Being solicited to express his opinion with respect to the choice of a successor, he mentioned the names of Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Cassino; of Otho, Bishop of Ostia; and of Hugo, Bishop of Lyons; suggesting, as a reason for giving priority to the former of the three, his presence at the moment in Italy.

“Three days before his death, on the question being brought before him of absolving the persons whom he had excommunicated, he replied, ‘With the exception of Henry, styled by his followers the king; of Guibert, the usurping claimant of the Roman See; and of those who, by advice or assistance, favour their evil and ungodly views, I absolve and bless all men who unfeignedly believe me to possess this power, as the representative of St. Peter and St. Paul.’ And then, addressing those around him, for some time, in the language of warning, he thus impressively concluded: ‘In the name of the Almighty God, and by the power of His holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, I adjure you, recognise no one as my successor in the Roman see, who shall not have been duly elected and canonically ordained by Apostolic authority.’

“On the 25th of May, 1085, he peacefully closed his earthly career; just rallying strength, amid the exhaustion of his powers, to utter, with his departing breath, the words, ‘I have loved justice, and hated iniquity; and therefore I die in exile.’

“‘In exile!’ said a prelate who stood by his bed,—too late, however, as it would seem, to arrest the attention of the departing spirit,—‘in exile thou canst not die! Vicar of Christ and His Apostles, thou hast received the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.’”—Vol. ii. pp. 322, 324.

Gregory thought he had failed. So it is: often a cause seems to decline as its champion grows in years, and to die in his death. But this is to judge hastily; others are destined to complete what he began. No man is given to see his work through. Man goes forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening, but the evening falls before it is done. There was One alone who began and finished and died.

PRIVATE JUDGMENT.¹

GERALDINE has been already introduced to our readers as a convert to the Church of Rome, as real as the heroine of a tale can be ; or more real, if, as report goes, she be in some respects the shadow of the authoress. Mr. Lucas is a convert in good earnest, every inch of him, and writes to recommend the Protestant world in general, and the Society of Friends in particular, to follow his example. Mr. Spencer, it is scarcely necessary to say, is another ; and his sermon preached at Manchester contains, according to Mr. Sandford, an account of the motives which occasioned his change. Thomas Platter is the example of a convert in the opposite direction, and of somewhat more than 300 years' standing. Here, then, we have four instances of conversion—one to Protestantism, and three to Rome, differing in most points from one another ; but all of them illustrating the operation of private judgment in matters of faith.

¹ From the *British Critic* of July 1841. The essay is suggested by a group of polemical publications :—*Autobiography of Thomas Platter, a Schoolmaster of the Sixteenth Century* ; translated from the German. *Reasons for becoming a Roman Catholic* ; addressed to the Society of Friends ; by F. Lucas. *A Letter to the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, on his Sermon preached at Manchester* ; by the Rev. G. B. Sandford, M.A. *Geraldine: a Tale of Conscience* ; by E. C. A. *A Few Words in Support of No. 90 of the Tracts for the Times. A Few More Words in Support of No. 90 of the Tracts for the Times* ; by the Rev. W. G. Ward, M.A. *Letters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, to N. Wiseman, D.D. ; containing Remarks on his Letter to Mr. Newman, etc.* ; by the Rev. W. Palmer. *The Articles treated on in Tract 90 reconsidered and their Interpretation vindicated, in a Letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D., Canon of Christ Church* ; by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D.

We propose to use them as an occasion for one or two remarks on the subject of private judgment, if it is possible that readers are to be found of a patience equal to the toleration of a subject so exhausted and so hopeless ; and we have added some of the pamphlets which the Oxford controversy has produced, in the belief that they furnish suitable illustrations of a point which must be introduced rather prominently in the course of our discussion. Of the pamphlets which have appeared on this occasion, the first in importance, and, we will add, in beauty of composition, is, as might have been anticipated, Dr. Pusey's, which it would be a great injustice to attempt to characterise or sum up in a few words, but which, we will venture to say, no fair person will be able to read without extreme interest and profit. Mr. Ward's two pamphlets are able and manly assertions of the right possessed by subscribers to the Thirty-nine Articles of holding anti-Protestant opinions, supported by a great deal of acute remark, and recommended by a most Christian and charitable tone. Mr. Palmer's are very learned and serviceable compositions, as what is not which he writes? About their tone, which has pained us, we will say a severe thing—that they are very unlike his gentle and amiable self, or rather, they are like a most amiable man thinking it a duty to be unamiable. However, we are pleased to add, that in the fifth letter he has thrown off this artificial dress, and appears in his natural character. So much for controversialists ; now to return to our four converts.

Of these, Geraldine is a young lady, who professes to examine fathers and divines for herself. She admires the appearances of life in the (so-called) Evangelical body, but thinks cheaply of their intellect ; she much respects the opposite section in the Church, but does not sympathise in its ethical temper. She considers the former deficient in consistency of view, the latter in consistency of practice ; the former shallow, the latter cold and formal ; and she betakes herself to Rome, with the hope of gaining light and heat together. Such is the history of the conversion of Geraldine.

Mr. Lucas, an educated and able man, originally a disciple of

Quakerism, to use his own term, considers it to be "the most spiritual" of all the sects, and that "the Anglican Protestants," on the other hand, are possessed of "solemn liturgies and devout services;" but then Anglicanism is the "gigantic skeleton" of what once had life, and the Friends again have "cast away the shell, and seek only for the kernel." He too, somewhat like Geraldine, recognises in the Church of Rome both the body and the soul—forms, which are withal divine, "the spiritual essence" of religion "everywhere indissolubly married by divine ordinance to the outward symbol." Here are the reasons which wrought Mr. Lucas's conversion.

Mr. Spencer, a gentleman of noble birth, high character, much earnestness, a clergyman of our Church, and a chaplain to the present Bishop of London, is converted on four reasons, as they are stated in Mr. Sandford's well reasoned and excellent tempered Letter; first, because the English Church is Protestant, and no branch of the Catholic Church; next, because our clergy are not well informed in regard to the doctrines which they themselves hold; thirdly, because it is safer to belong to a communion which is not condemned by its opponents, than to one which is; lastly and principally, because whereas the Church of Christ is one, and cannot but be one, there are among Protestants very numerous divisions. Such are the reasons which Mr. Spencer's private judgment has created or adopted for leaving the English Church for the Roman.

Master Thomas Platter, a Swiss schoolmaster of the sixteenth century, of energetic mind, and eventually of some learning, exercised his private judgment in a far different way, and at a far earlier age. His first essay was when he was five years and a half old, on occasion of his being put to school with his uncle, Mr. Anthony, a priest and a very passionate man. In consequence of the ill-treatment he received from the hands of this personage, he had often occasion, he tells us, to "scream like a goat, that had the knife sticking into it," and in the event he made up his mind to go on his travels with a relation, who was on his way to the German schools, in the capacity of his servant or fag. The engagement between them was, that Thomas was

to beg as they went, and Paul, the student, was to support him out of his earnings. They first came to Breslau, and then they migrated to Munich, where they fell in "with a soap-boiler of the name of Schräll, who was a Master of Arts at Vienna, but an enemy to the clerical state." Thomas was now in the way to gain light, and that way widened upon him, and grew broader and broader after he had run away from his kinsman and master, and begged and schooled on his own account at Zurich and elsewhere. He had been born on Shrove Tuesday, just as people were going to mass, and in consequence a persuasion prevailed that he was destined to be a priest; but the life he had been leading for years, though nominally in the pursuit of knowledge, had issued in a knowledge rather of the world than of books. At eighteen he had not mastered his Latin grammar. Once when he came to his mother, after an absence of five years, in which he had travelled far and wide,—but let us use his own words:—

"The first word she said to me was, 'Has the devil carried you hither once more?' I answered, 'The devil has not carried me, but my feet; however, I will not long be a burden to you.' Then she said, 'You are not a burden to me; but it grieves me that you go strolling backwards and forwards in this manner, and, without doubt, learn nothing at all. If you learned to work, as your late father also did, that would be better; you will never be a priest.' So I remained with her two or three days."—P. 44.

After this he went again to Zurich, and put himself under Myconius, who, "without doubt, was already acquainted with the pure doctrine," says he, "but was *obliged* notwithstanding to go to church at Frauenmünster with his scholars, to sing the vespers, matins, and masses, and to direct the singing." Platter participated in his master's illumination, till at last we read of the following grand burst of private judgment, which, little as we wish to be thought patrons of idolatry, seems to us almost as bad:—

"At the time that I was *custos*, I often had no wood for the heating of the school. One morning Zuinglius was to preach before day at

Frauenmünster, and as they were ringing the bell for service, and there was no wood for heating the school, I thought, in my simplicity, 'You have no wood, and there are so many idols in the church!' As no one was there, I went into the church to the nearest altar, seized a wooden St. John, hurried with him into the school into the oven, and said to him, 'Johnny, now bend yourself, you must go into the oven, even though you represent a St. John.' When he began to burn, there were nasty great blisters from the oil paint. I thought, 'Now hold still; if you stir, which, however, you will not do, I will shut to the door of the oven, and you dare not come out, unless the evil one fetches you.' In the meantime the wife of Myconius came, who wished to go to church to the sermon, and said, 'God give you a good day, my son; have you heated the oven?' I closed the oven door, and said 'Yes, mother, I am quite ready.' I would not, however, tell it to her; for if it had been known, it would at that time have cost me my life. In the schools, Myconius said, 'Custos, you have had famous wood to-day.' I thought, 'St. John deserves the most praise. When we were to sing the mass, two priests were quarrelling together, and one said to the other, 'You Lutheran knave, you have robbed me of a St. John.' This they continued a good while. Myconius did not know what the matter was; but St. John was never found again. Of course I never told it to any one till several years after, when Myconius was preacher at Basle; then I told it to him, and he wondered very much, and remembered well how the priests had quarrelled together. Although it appeared to me then that Popery was a mere mummary, *yet I still had it in my mind to become a priest*, and to do the duties of my office faithfully, and deck out my altar smartly. For of real piety I understood at that time nothing; all rested merely on outward ceremonies." —Pp. 48-50.

Next he got acquainted with Zwingle, and considers that he grew more serious in consequence; how his seriousness showed itself, the following extract is evidence:—

"At that time six of us went home to St. Gall; and as we came on a Saturday to Glyss, we heard that the priests were singing vespers. After vespers, one came and asked, 'Whence do you come?' I, as the boldest, replied 'From Zurich.' Then the priest said, 'What have you done in that heretic city?' I became angry, and said, 'Why heretic city?' The priest replied, 'Therefore, because they have put away the

mass, and removed the pictures from the churches.' Thereupon I said, 'That is not so, for they still celebrate mass there; they have also pictures: why are they then heretics?' 'For this reason,' he replied, 'because they do not consider the Pope as the head of the Christian Church, and do not call upon the saints.' I went on, 'Why is the Pope the head of the Christian Church?' He said, 'Therefore, because St. Peter was Pope at Rome, and has given the popedom there to his successors.' I said, 'St. Peter has very likely never been to Rome;' pulled my New Testament out of the bag, and showed him how (in the Epistle to the Romans) the Apostle salutes so many, and yet never mentions St. Peter, who, according to his assertion, was the most eminent among the Christians of that place. Thereupon he said, 'How could that be true then, that Christ met St. Peter outside the city of Rome, and he asked Him where he was going to? whereupon Christ answered, to Rome, to allow myself to be crucified.' I asked, 'Where have you read this story?' He said, 'I often heard it from my grandmother.' Thereupon I answered, 'So then I perceive that your grandmother is your Bible. And why should one call upon the saints?' Answer: 'Therefore, because it is written, God is wonderful in all His works.' Then I stooped down, broke off a little plant, and said, if one were to collect all men together, they would not be able to make a plant like this.' Then he became angry, and our conversation ended."—Pp. 52-54.

Such is the history of the private judgment of Master Platter; very different, certainly, from that exhibited in the person of Geraldine or Mr. Lucas, yet equally private judgment with theirs. Are exercises of mind, which end so diversely, one and all pleasing to the Divine Author of faith; or rather must they not contain some inherent, or some incidental defect, if they manifest such divergence? Must private judgment in all cases be a good *per force*; or is it a good under circumstances, and with limitations? Or is it a good when it is not an evil? Or is it a good and evil at once, a good involving an evil? Or is it an absolute and simple evil? Questions of this sort rise in the mind on contemplating a principle which leads to Rome as well as to Zurich or Geneva; and, in consequence, whatever we may now be able to do, in the way of giving plain rules for its exercise, be it greater or less, will be so much gain.

Now the first remark which occurs is an obvious one, which, we suppose, will be suffered to pass without opposition, that whatever be the intrinsic merits of private judgment, yet, if it at all exerts itself in the direction of proselytism and conversion, a certain *onus probandi* is upon it, and it must show cause, before it is tolerated, why it should not be convicted forthwith as a breach of the peace, and silenced *instante* as a mere disturber of the existing constitution of things. Of course it may be safely exercised in defending what is established; and we are far indeed from saying, that it is never to advance in the direction of change or revolution, else the Gospel itself could never have been introduced; but we consider that such material changes have a *prima facie* case against them; they have something to get over, and have to prove their admissibility, before it can reasonably be granted; and their agents may be called upon to suffer, in order to prove their earnestness, and to pay the penalty of the trouble they are causing. Considering the special countenance given in Scripture to quiet unanimity and contentedness, and the warnings directed against disorder, irregularity, a wavering temper, discord, and division; considering the emphatic words of the Apostle, laid down as a general principle, and illustrated in detail, "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called;" considering, in a word, that change is really the characteristic of error, and unalterableness the attribute of truth, of holiness, of Almighty God Himself, we consider that when private judgment moves in the direction of innovation, it may well be regarded with suspicion and treated with severity. Nay, we confess even a satisfaction, when a penalty is attached to the expression of new doctrines, or to a change of communion. We repeat it, if persons have strong feelings they should pay for them; if they think it a duty to unsettle things established, they should show their earnestness by being willing to suffer. We shall be the last to complain of this kind of persecution, even though directed against what we consider the cause of truth. Such disadvantages do no harm to that cause in the event, but they bring home to a man's mind his own responsibility; they are a memento to him

of a great moral law, and warn him that his private judgment, if not a duty, is a sin.

An act of private judgment is, in its very idea, an act of individual responsibility; this is a consideration which will come with especial force on a conscientious mind, when it is to have so fearful an issue as a change of religion. A religious man will say to himself, "If I am in error at present, I am in error by a disposition of Providence, which has placed me where I am; if I change into an error, this is my own act. It is much less fearful to be born at disadvantage, than to place myself at disadvantage."

And if the voice of men in general is to weigh at all in a matter of this kind, it does but corroborate these instinctive feelings. A convert is undeniably in favour with no party; he is looked at with distrust, contempt, and aversion by all. His former friends think him a good riddance, and his new friends are cold and strange; and as to the impartial public, their very first impulse is to impute the change to some eccentricity or character, or fickleness of mind, or tender attachment, or private interest. Their utmost praise is the reluctant confession that "doubtless he is very sincere." Churchmen and Dissenters, men of Rome and men of the kirk, are equally open to this remark. Not on extraordinary occasions only, but, as a matter of course, whenever the news of a conversion to Romanism, or to Irvingism, or to the Plymouth sect, or to Unitarianism, is brought to us, we say, one and all of us, "No wonder, such a one has lived so long abroad;" or, "He is of such a very imaginative turn;" or, "He is so excitable and odd;" or, "What could he do? all his family turned;" or, "It was a reaction in consequence of an injudicious education;" or, "Trade makes men cold, or a little learning makes them shallow in their religion." If, then, the common voice of mankind goes for anything, must we not consider it to be the *rule*, that men change their religion, not on reason, but for some extra-rational feeling or motive? Now, for ourselves, we are not quarrelling with this testimony, we are willing to resign ourselves to it; but we think there are parties whom it concerns much to ponder it. Surely it is a

strong, and, as they must feel, an alarming proof, that for all the haranguing and protesting which goes on in Exeter and other halls, this great people is not such a conscientious supporter of the sacred right of private judgment as a good Protestant would desire. Why should we go out of our way, one and all of us, to impute personal reasons in explanation of the conversion of every individual convert, as he comes before us, if there were in us the public, an adhesion to that absolute, and universal, and unalienable principle, as its titles are set forth in heraldic style, high and deep, sacred and awful, the right, and the duty, and the power of private judgment. Why should we confess it in the general, yet promptly and pointedly deny it in every particular, if our hearts retained more than the "*magni nominis umbra*," when we spoke of the Protestant principle? Is it not sheer wantonness and cruelty in Baptist, Independent, Irvingite, Wesleyan, Establishment-man, Jumper, and Mormonite, to delight in trampling on and crushing these manifestations of their own pure and precious charter, instead of dutifully and reverently exalting, at Bethel, or at Dan, each instance of it, as it occurs, to the gaze of its professing votaries? If my daughter turns Roman, and betakes herself to a convent, why do I not exult in the occurrence? Why do I not give a public breakfast, or hold a meeting, or erect an obelisk, or write a pamphlet, in honour of her, and of the great undying principle she has so gloriously vindicated? Why am I in this base disloyal style muttering about priests, and Jesuits, and the horrors of nunneries, in solution of the phenomenon, when I have the fair and ample form of Private Judgment rising before me, and pleading with me, and bidding me impute good motives, not bad, and in very charity ascribe to the influence of a high and holy principle, to her influence, what my poor human nature is fain to set down as a folly or a sin? All this would lead us to suspect that the doctrine of private judgment, in its simplicity, purity, and integrity, Private-judgment, all Private-judgment, and nothing but Private-judgment, is held by very few persons indeed; and that the great mass of the population are either stark unbelievers in it, or deplorably dark about it; and that even the minority that remain

have glossed and corrupted the true sense of it by a miserably faulty reading, and hold, not the right of private judgment, but the private right of judgment; in other words, their own private right, and no one's else. To us it seems as clear as day, that they consider that they themselves, indeed, individually can and do act on reason, and nothing but reason; that they have the gift of advancing, without bias or unsteadiness, throughout their search, from premise to conclusion, from text to doctrine; that they have sought and found, but that no one else is thus favoured; that they alone have found out the art of putting the salt upon the bird's tail, and have rescued themselves from being the slaves of circumstance and the creatures of impulse. It is undeniable, then, if the popular feeling is to be our guide, that, high and mighty as the principle of private judgment is in religious inquiries, as we most fully grant it is, still it bears some similarity to Saul's armour which David rejected, or to edged tools which have a bad trick of chopping at our fingers, when we are but simply and innocently meaning them to make a dash forward at truth.

Any tolerably serious man will feel this in his own case more vividly than any one else. Who can know ever so little of himself without suspecting all kinds of imperfect and wrong motives in everything he attempts? And then there is the bias of education and of habit; and, added to the difficulties thence resulting, those which arise from weakness of the reasoning faculty, ignorance or imperfect knowledge of the original languages of Scripture, and again, of history and antiquity. These things being considered, we lay it down as a truth, from which, we think, few ought to dissent, that Divine aid alone can carry any one safely and successfully through an inquiry after religious truth. That there are certain very broad contrasts between one religion and another, in which no one would be at fault what to think and what to choose, is very certain; but the problem proposed to private judgment, at this day, is of a rather more complicated nature. Taking things as they are, we all seem to be in Solomon's case, when he said, "I am but a little child; I know not how to go out or come in; and Thy servant is in the midst of a great people, that cannot be numbered nor counted for

multitude. Give, therefore, Thy servant an understanding heart, that I may discern between good and bad." It is useless, surely, attempting to inquire or judge, unless a Divine command enjoin the work upon us, and a Divine promise sustain us through it. Supposing, indeed, such a command and promise be given, then, of course, there is no difficulty in the matter. Whatever be our personal infirmities, He whom we serve can overrule or supersede them. An act of duty must always be right; and will be accepted, whatever be its success, because done in obedience to His will. And He can bless the most unpromising circumstances; He can even lead us forward by means of our mistakes into a revelation; He can convert us, if He will, through the very obstinacy or self-will or superstition which mixes itself up with our better feelings, and defiles, yet is sanctified by our sincerity. And much more can He shed upon our path supernatural light, if He so will, and give us an insight into the meaning of Scripture, and a hold of the sense of antiquity, to which our own unaided powers never could have attained. All this is certain; He continually leads us forward in the midst of darkness; and we live, not by bread only, but by His Word converting the hard rock or salt sea into nourishment. The simple question is, *has* He, in this particular case, commanded, *has* He promised? and how far? If He has, and as far as He has, all is easy; if He has not, all is, we will not say impossible, but what is worse, undutiful or presumptuous. Our business is to ask with St. Paul, when arrested in his frenzy, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" This is the simple question. He can bless our present state; He can bless our change; *which* is it His will to bless? If Wesleyan or Independent has come over to us apart from this spirit, we do not much pride ourselves in our convert. If he joins us because he thinks he has a right to judge for himself, or because forms are of no consequence, or merely because Dissent has its errors and inconveniences, or because an Established Church is an efficacious means of spreading religion, he plainly thinks that the choice of a communion is not a more serious matter than the choice of a neighbourhood or of an insurance office. In like manner, if

members of our communion have left it for Rome, because of the *æsthetic* beauty of the latter, and the grandeur of its pretensions, we are grieved, but, good luck to them, we can spare them. And if Roman Catholics join us or our "Dissenting brethren," because their own Church is behind the age, insists on Aristotelic dogmas, and interferes with liberty of thought, such a conversion is no triumph over popery, but over St. Peter and St. Paul. Our only safety is in obedience; our only comfort in aiming at it.

If this be so, we have arrived at the following conclusion: that it is our duty to betake ourselves to Scripture, and to observe how far the private search of a religion is there sanctioned, and under what circumstances. This, then, is the next point which comes under consideration.

Now the first and most ordinary sort of private judgment, if it deserves the name, which is recognised in Scripture, is that which takes place without conscious or deliberate purpose. While Lydia heard St. Paul preach, her heart was opened. She had it not in mind to exercise any supposed sacred right, she was not setting about the choice of a religion, but she was drawn on to accept the Gospel by a moral persuasion. "To him that hath more shall be given," not in the way of judging or choosing, but of an inward development met by external disclosures. Lydia's instance is the type of a multitude of cases, differing very much from each other, some divinely ordered, others merely human, some which would commonly be called cases of private judgment, and others which certainly would not, but all agreeing in this, that the judgment exercised is not recognised and realised by the party exercising it as the subject-matter of command, promise, duty, privilege, or anything else. It is but the spontaneous stirring of the affections within, or the passive acceptance of what is offered from without. St. Paul baptised Lydia's household also; it would seem, then, that he baptised servants or slaves, who had very little power of judging between a true religion and a false; shall we say that they, like their mistress, accepted the Gospel on private judgment or not? Did the thousands baptised in national conversions exercise their private judgment or not? Do children when taught their

catechism? Most persons will reply in the negative; yet it will be difficult to separate their case in principle from what Lydia's may have been, that is, the case of religious persons who are being led forward into truth, how they know not. Neither the one nor the other have undertaken to inquire and judge, or have set about being converted, or have got their reasons all before them and together, to discharge at an enemy or passer-by on fit occasions. The difference between them is in the state of their hearts: the one party consist of unformed minds, or senseless and dead, or minds under temporary excitement, who are brought over by external or accidental influences, without any real sympathy for the religion, which is given them *in order* that they may learn sympathy with it, and who, as time goes on, fall away again if they are not happy enough to become imbued with it; and in the other party there is already a sympathy between the external word and the heart within. The one are proselyted by force, authority, or their mere feelings; the others through their habitual and abiding frame of mind and cast of opinion. But neither can be said, in the ordinary sense of the word, to inquire, reason, and decide about religion. And yet in a great number of these cases, certainly where the persons in question were come to years of discretion and turned out consistent in their religious profession afterwards, they would be commonly set forth by Protestant minds as instances of the due exercise of the right of private judgment. Such are the greater number perhaps of converts at this day; and their exercise of private judgment is neither right nor wrong in itself, it is a spontaneous act which they do not think about; if it is anything, it is but a means of bringing out their hearts one way or the other. Often, as in the case of very illiterate and senseless persons, it proves nothing either way; but in those who are not so, it is right or wrong as their hearts are right or wrong; it is an exercise not of reason but of heart. Take, for instance, the case of a servant in a family. She is baptised and educated in the Church of England, and is religiously disposed; she goes into Scotland, and conforms to the Kirk, to which her master and mistress belong. She is, of course, responsible for what she

does, but no one would say that she had formed any purpose, or taken any deliberate step. In course of time, when perhaps taxed with the change, she would say in her defence that outward forms matter not, and that there are good men in Scotland as well as in England; but this is an afterthought. Again, a careless person, nominally a Churchman, falls among serious-minded Dissenters, and they reclaim him from vice or irreligion; on this he joins their communion, and in time to come boasts of his right of private judgment. At the time itself, however, no process of inquiry took place within him at all; his heart was "opened," whether for good or for bad, whether by good influences or by good and bad mixed. He was not conscious of clear reasons, but he took what came to hand, he embraced what was given, he felt and he acted. Again, a man is brought up among Unitarians, or in the frigid and worldly school which got a footing in the Church during last century, and has been accustomed to view religion as a matter of reason and form, of obligation, to the exclusion of affectionateness and devotion. He falls among persons of what is called an Evangelical cast, and finds his heart interested, and great objects set before it. Such a man falls in with the sentiments he finds, rather than adopts them. He follows the leadings of his heart, perhaps of Divine grace, but certainly not any course of inquiry and proof. There is nothing of argument, discussion, or choice in the process of his conversion. He has no systems to choose between, and no grounds to scrutinise.

Now, in all such cases the sort of private judgment exercised is right or wrong, not as private judgment, but according to its circumstances. It is either the drawing of a divine influence, which we cannot master or analyse, or it is a feeling which it is a positive duty as far as possible to make subjective and to reduce to a rational form, in order that we may decide whether the particular instance of it is right or wrong. If it is the former, it is above a private judgment, popularly so called; if the latter, it is not yet so much as one.

A second class of conversions on private judgment consists of those which take place upon the sight or the strong testimony

of miracles. Such was the instance of Rahab, of Naaman, if he may be called a convert, and of Nebuchadnezzar, of the blind man in John ix., of St. Paul, of Cornelius, of Sergius Paulus, and many others. Here again the act of judgment is of a very peculiar character. It is not exactly an unconscious act, but yet it is hardly an act of judgment. Our belief in public sensible facts cannot be properly called an act of private judgment, yet since Protestants, we suppose, would say that the blind man or Sergius Paulus were converted on private judgment, let it even so be called, though of a very particular kind. Again, conviction upon a miracle also implies the latent belief that such acts are signs of Divine presence, a belief which may be as generally recognised and maintained and as little a peculiar or private feeling as the impression on the senses of the miracle itself. And this leads to the mention of a further specimen of the sort of private judgments to which men are invited in Scripture, viz., exercise of the moral sense. Our Creator has stamped certain great truths upon our minds, and there they remain in spite of the Fall. St. Paul appeals to one of these at Lystra, calling on the worshippers of idols to turn from these vanities unto the Living God; and at Athens, "not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art and man's device," but to worship "God who made the world, and all things therein." In the same tone he reminds the Thessalonians of their having "turned to God from idols to serve the Living and True God." In like manner, doubtless, other great principles also of religion and morals are rooted in the mind so deeply that their denial by any religion would be a justification of our quitting or rejecting it. If a pagan found his ecclesiastical polity essentially founded on lying and cheating, or his ritual essentially impure, or his moral code essentially unjust or cruel, we conceive this would be a sufficient reason for his renouncing it for one which was free from these hateful characteristics. Such again is the kind of private judgment exercised, when maxims or principles generally admitted in the world are acted upon by individuals as a matter of course, who have been ever taught them; for instance, if a member of the

English Church, who had always been taught that preaching is the great ordinance of the Gospel, to the disparagement of the sacraments, thereupon placed himself under the ministry of a powerful Wesleyan preacher; or if, from the common belief that nothing is essential but what is on the surface of Scripture, he forthwith attached himself to the Baptists, Independents, or Unitarians. Such men indeed often take their line in consequence of some inward liking for the religious system they adopt; but we are speaking of their proceeding as far as it pretends to be an act of judgment.

A third class of private judgments recorded in Scripture are those which were exercised at one and the same time by a great number—if it be not a contradiction to call such judgments private. Yet here again we suppose staunch Protestants would maintain that the three thousand at Pentecost, and the five thousand after the miracle on the lame man, and the “great company of the priests” which shortly followed, did avail themselves, and did give specimens of their sacred right; therefore let it be ruled so. Such, then, is the case of national conversions to which we have already alluded. Again, if the Lutheran Church of Germany with its many theologians, or our neighbour the Kirk, General Assembly, Men of Strathbogie, Dr. Chalmers, and all, came to a unanimous or quasi-unanimous resolve to submit to the Archbishop of Canterbury as their patriarch, this doubtless would be an exercise of private judgment, perfectly defensible on Scripture precedents.

Now, before proceeding, let us observe, that as yet nothing has been found in Scripture to justify the cases of private judgment which are exemplified in the books which lie before us. These are instances of a conversion, made on the judgment, definite, deliberate, isolated, of the persons converted. Geraldine does not profess to have seen miracles, nor Mr. Spencer to have been seduced on to Rome by received Protestant principles, or by accredited maxims of the see of London; nor Mr. Lucas to have been converted unconsciously without the possibility of any deliberate inquiry at all. Thomas Platter seems to have the most to say for himself; for at least he followed a

multitude in renouncing the Catholic religion for Zwinglianism, whether such conduct was like that of the 3000 in the Book of Acts or no. Let us then turn to Scripture a second time, to see whether we can gain thence any clearer sanction of private judgment as now exercised among us, than our search into it has hitherto furnished us.

There certainly is another method of conversion upon private judgment there described, which is much more to our purpose—viz., by means of the study of Scripture. Thus our Lord says to the Jews, “Search the Scriptures;” and the treasurer of Candace was reading the Book of Isaiah when St. Philip met him; and the men of Berea are said to be “more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and *searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.*” And it is added, “*therefore many of them believed.*” Here at length, it will be said, is a precedent for such acts of private judgment as those of Geraldine or Thomas Platter; and indeed these texts commonly are so understood, as if they made it certain beyond dispute that individuals ordinarily may find out the doctrine of the Gospel for themselves from the private study of Scripture. A little consideration, however, will convince us that even these are precedents for something else; that they sanction, not an inquiry about Gospel doctrine, but about the Gospel teacher; not what has God revealed, but whom has He commissioned? And this is a very different thing.

The connection in which our Lord speaks of searching the Scriptures, shows beyond dispute that they were calculated to lead His hearers, not to a knowledge of the Gospel, but of Him, its author and teacher. “Whom He hath sent,” He says, “Him ye believe not. Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which *testify of Me.*” He adds, that they “will not come unto Him, that they may have life,” and that “He is come in His Father’s name, and they receive Him not.” And again, “Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me, for he *wrote of Me.*” It is plain that in this passage our Lord does not send His hearers to the Old Testament to gain the Gospel thence by their private judgment,

but to gain tests or notes on which to receive Him, as the teacher of that Gospel; and though the eunuch appears in the narrative to be contemplating our Lord in prophecy, not as the teacher but the object of the Faith, yet in confessing that he could not "understand" what he was reading, "unless some man should guide him," he lays down the principle broadly, which we desire here to maintain, that the private student of Scripture would not ordinarily gain a knowledge of the Gospel from it. In like manner St. Peter, on the day of Pentecost, refers to the Book of Joel, by way of proving thence, not the Christian doctrine, but the Divine promise that new teachers were to be sent in due season, and the fact that it was fulfilled in himself and his brethren. "This is that," he says, "which was spoken by the prophet Joel, I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh, and *your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.*"

While, then, the conversions recorded in Scripture are brought about in a very marked way through a *teacher*, and not by means of private judgment; so again, if an appeal is made to private judgment, this is done in order to settle who the teacher is, and what are his notes or tokens, rather than to substantiate this or that religious opinion or practice. And if such instances bear upon our conduct at this day, as it is natural to think they do, then of course the practical question before us is, *Who* is the teacher now from whose mouth we are to seek the law, and *what are his notes?*

Now, in remarkable coincidence with this view, we find in both Testaments that teachers are promised under the dispensation of the Gospel, so that they who, like the noble Bereans, search the Scriptures daily, will be at little loss to know *whither* their private judgment should lead them in order to gain the knowledge of the truth. In the Book of Isaiah we have the following express promises: "Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the waters of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed into a corner any more, but *thine eyes shall see thy teachers*, and *thine ears shall hear a voice behind thee*, saying, This is the way," etc. Several tests follow descriptive of the condition of things or the locality where these

teachers are to be found. First, the absence of idolatry, "Ye shall defile also the covering of thy graven images of silver, and the ornaments of thy molten images of gold;" and next increase and multitude, "Then shall He give the *rain of thy seed*, that thou shalt sow the ground withal; in that day shall thy cattle feed *in large pastures*." Elsewhere the appointed teacher is addressed under the figure of a woman, as "*condemning every tongue* that shall be raised against her in judgment." And here again the promises or tests of extent and perpetuity follow: "Thou shalt teach further on the right hand and on the left, and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles;" and "My kindness shall not depart from them, neither shall the covenant of My peace be removed." Elsewhere holiness is mentioned: "It shall be called, The way of *holiness*, the *unclean* shall not pass over it." One more promise shall be cited: "My Spirit that is upon thee, and My words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, from henceforth and for ever."

In the New Testament we have the same promises stated far more concisely indeed, but what is much more apposite than a longer description, with the addition of the *name* of our promised teacher: "The *Church* of the living God," says St. Paul, "*the pillar and ground of the truth*." The simple question then for private judgment to exercise itself upon is, what and where is the Church?

Now let it be observed how exactly this view of the province of private judgment, where it is allowable, as being the discovery not of doctrine, but of the teacher of doctrine, harmonises both with the nature of religion and the state of human society as we find it. Religion is for practice, and that immediate. Now it is much easier to form a correct and rapid judgment of persons than of books or of doctrines. Every one, even a child, has an impression about new faces; few persons have any real view about new propositions. There is something in the sight of persons or of bodies of men which speaks to us for approval or disapprobation with a distinctness to which pen and ink are unequal. This is just the kind of evidence which is needed for

use, where private judgment is intended to be the means of our conversion. The multitude have neither the time, patience, nor clearness and exactness of thought for processes of investigation and deduction. Reason is slow and abstract, cold and speculative; but man is a being of feeling and action; he is not resolvable into a *dictum de omni et nullo*, or a series of hypotheticals, or a critical diatribe, or an algebraical equation. And this obvious fact does, as far as it goes, make it probable that, if we are providentially obliged to exercise our private judgment, we should have to decide upon the teacher rather than upon the doctrine.

In corroboration, it may be observed, that Scripture seems always to imply the presence of teachers as the appointed ordinance by which men learn the truth; and is principally engaged in giving cautions against false teachers, and tests for ascertaining the true. Thus our Lord bids us in one place "beware of false prophets," and look to their fruits. And He says elsewhere that "the sheep know His voice," and that "they know not the voice of strangers." And He predicts false Christs and false prophets, who are to be nearly successful against even the elect. He does not give us tests of false doctrines, but of certain visible peculiarities or notes applicable to persons or parties. "If they shall say, behold, He is in the desert, go not forth; behold He is in the secret chamber, believe it not." St. Paul specifies tokens of a similar kind: "Mark them which cause divisions, and avoid them;" "is Christ divided?" "beware of dogs, beware of evil-workers;" "be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so, as ye have us for an ensample." Thus the New Testament equally with the Old, as far as it speaks of private examination into doctrines professedly from heaven, makes their teacher the subject of that inquiry and not their matter; it bids us ask for his credentials, and avoid him if he is unholy, or idolatrous, or schismatical, or if he comes in his own name, or if he claims no authority, or is the growth of a particular spot or particular circumstances. If there are passages which at first sight seem to interfere with this statement, they admit of an easy explanation. Either they will be

found to appeal to those instinctive feelings of our nature already alluded to, in which argument and proof have little share in the processes of judgment by which we form our opinion of persons or bodies ; as St. Paul's reference to the idolatry of Athenian worship, or to the extreme moral corruption of heathenism generally. Or, again, the criterion of doctrine which they propose to the private judgment of the individual turns upon the question of its novelty or continual reception. When St. Paul would describe a false gospel, he calls it *another* gospel "than that ye have received;" and St. John bidding us "try the spirits," gives us as the test of truth and error, the "confessing that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," and warns us against receiving into our houses any one who "brings not this doctrine." We conceive, then, that on the whole the notion of gaining religious truth for ourselves by our private inquiry, whether by reading or thinking, whether by studying Scripture or other books, has no broad sanction in Scripture, is not impressed upon us by its general tone, nor enjoined in any of its commands. The great question which it puts before private judgment is, Who is God's prophet, and where? Who is to be considered the voice of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church?

Having proceeded in our train of thought as far as this, it is time for us to lay before the reader the thesis which the examples of conversion with which we began suggest—viz., that, on the principles that have been laid down, Dissenters ought to abandon their own communion, but that members of the English Church ought not to abandon theirs. Such a position has often been treated as a paradox and inconsistency; yet we hope to be able to recommend it favourably to the reader.

Now that seceders, sectarians, independent thinkers, and the like, by whatever name they call themselves, whether Wesleyans, Dissenters, professors of the national faith, well-wishers of the Church, or even Churchmen, are in grievous error, in their mode of exercising their private judgment, is plain as soon as stated; for they do not use it in looking out for a teacher at all. They who think they have found the teacher of truth, may be wrong in the result of their inquiry; but those who despise the

notion of a teacher altogether, are already wrong in its very beginning. They do not start with their private judgment in that one special direction which Scripture allows or requires. Scripture speaks of a certain pillar or ground of truth, as set up to the world, and describes it by certain characteristics; dissenting teachers and bodies, so far from professing to be this authority, or to contain among them this authority, assert there is no such authority to be found anywhere. When, then, we deny that they are the Church in our meaning of the word, they ought to take no offence at it, for we are not denying them anything to which they lay claim; we are but denying them what they put from them as much as we can. They must not act like the dog in the fable (if it be not too light a comparison), who would neither use the manger himself, nor relinquish it to others: let them not grudge to others a manifest Scriptural privilege which they disown themselves. Is an ordinance of Scripture to be fulfilled nowhere, because it is not fulfilled in them? By the Church, we mean what Scripture means, "the pillar and ground of the truth;" a power out of whose mouth the Word and the Spirit are never to fail, and whom whoso refuses to hear becomes thereupon to all his brethren a heathen man and a publican. Let the parties in question accept the Scripture definition, or drop the Scripture name; or, rather, let them seek elsewhere what they are conscious is not among themselves. We hear much of Bible Christians, Bible religion, Bible preaching; it would be well if we heard a little of the Bible Church also. We venture to say that Dissenting Churches would vanish thereupon at once, for, since it is their fundamental principle that they are not a pillar or ground of truth, but voluntary societies, without authority and without gifts, the Bible Church they cannot be. If the serious persons who are in dissent would imitate the simple-minded Ethiopian, or the noble Beræans, let them ask themselves, Of whom speaketh the apostle, or the prophet, such great things?—Who is it that is appointed to lead us to Christ?—Where are those teachers which were never to be removed into a corner any more, but which were ever to be before our eyes and in our ears? Who-

ever is right, or whoever is wrong, they cannot be right who profess not to have found, not to look out for, not to believe in the fact of an ordinance to which apostles and prophets give testimony. So much for Thomas Platter.

One half, then, of our thesis is easily disposed of ; but now we come to the other moiety, to which Geraldine and her companions invite us, and which certainly has its intricacies. It is not difficult to know how we should act towards a religious body which does not even profess to come to us in the name of the Lord, or to be a pillar and ground of the truth ; but what shall we say when more than one society, or school, or party, lay claim to be the heaven-sent teacher, and are rivals one to the other, as the Churches of England and Rome at this day ? How shall we discriminate between them ? Which are we to follow ? Are tests given us for that purpose ? Now, if tests are given us, we must use them ; but, if not, and so far as not, we must conclude that Providence foresaw that the difference between them would never be so great as to require of us to leave the one for the other.

Now it is certain that much *is* said in Scripture about rival teachers, and that at least some of these are so opposed to each other, that tests are given us, in order to our shunning the one party and accepting the other. In such cases, the one teacher is represented to be the minister of God, and the other the child and organ of evil. The one comes in God's name, the other professes to come simply in his own name. Such a contrast is presented to us in the conflict between Moses and the magicians of Egypt ; all is light on the one side, all darkness on the other. Or again, in the trial between Elijah and the prophets of Baal. There is no doubt, in such a case, that it would be our imperative duty at once to leave the teaching of Satan, and betake ourselves to the Law and the Prophets. And it will be observed, that to assist inquirers in doing so, the representatives of Almighty God have been enabled, in their contest with the enemy, to work miracles, as Moses, for instance, and Elijah, in order to make it clear which way the true teaching lay.

But now will any one say that the contrast between the Eng-

lish and the Roman, or again, the Greek Churches, is of this nature?—is any of the three a “*monstrum nullâ virtute redemptum?*” Moreover, the magicians and the priests of Baal “came in their own name;” is that the case with the Church, English, Roman, or Greek? is it not certain, even at first sight, that each of these branches has many high gifts and much grace in her communion? And, at any rate, to turn to the case of Geraldine and the rest, if they would maintain that the Church of England is the false prophet, and the Church of Rome the true, then let the Church of Rome work miracles, as Moses did in the presence of the magicians, in order to our conviction.

Probably, however, it will be admitted that the contrast between England and Rome is not of that nature; for the English Church confessedly does not come in her own name, nor can she reasonably be compared to the Egyptian magicians or the prophets of Baal; is there then any other type in Scripture to which the difference between her and the Church of Rome can be resolved? We shall be referred, perhaps, to the case of the false prophets of Israel and Judah, who professed to come in the name of the Lord, yet did not preach the truth, and had no part or inheritance with God’s prophets. This parallel is not more happy than the former, for a test was given to distinguish between them, which does not decide between the Church of Rome and ourselves. This test is the Divine accomplishment of the prophet’s message, or the Divine blessing upon his teaching, or the eventual success of his work, as it may be variously stated: a test under which neither Church will fail, and neither is eminently the foremost. Each Church has had to endure trial, each has overcome it; each has triumphed over enemies, each has had continued signs of Divine favour upon it. The passages in Scripture to which we refer are such as the following. Moses, for instance, has laid it down in the Book of Deuteronomy, that “when a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath *not* spoken, but the prophet hath spoke it presumptuously.” To the same effect, in the Book of Ezekiel, the denunciation against the false prophets is, “Lo! *when the wall is fallen*, shall

it not be said unto you, *where* is the daubing wherewith ye have daubed it?" And Gamaliel's advice to "refrain from these men, and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought," may be taken as an illustration of the same rule of judgment. Hence Roman Catholics themselves are accustomed to consider, that eventual failure is the sure destiny of heresy and schism; what will Geraldine say to this? the English Church has remained in its present state three hundred years, and at the end of the time is stronger than at the beginning. This does not look like a heretical or schismatical Church. However, when she does fall to pieces, then, it may be admitted, her children will have a reason for deserting her; till then, she has no symptom of being akin to the false prophets who professed the Lord's name, and deceived the simple and unlearned; she has no symptom of being a traitor to the *faith*.

However, there is a third type of rival teaching mentioned in Scripture,—though not as between truth and falsehood, or faith and heresy,—under which the dissension between Rome and England may be considered to fall, though whether its application to present circumstances will serve those who, with the characters real and fictitious in our heading, leave the Anglican for the rival communion, in justification of their procedure, is not so clear. Let it be observed, then, that even in the Apostle's age very grave outward differences seem to have existed between Christian teachers, or the organs of the one Church, and yet those differences were not, in consequence, any call upon inquirers and beholders to quit one teacher and betake themselves to another. The state of the Corinthian Christians will exemplify what we mean: Paul, Cephas, and Apollos were all friends together, yet parties were formed round each separately, which disagreed with each other, and made the Apostles themselves seem in disagreement. Is not this, at least in great measure, the state of the Churches of England and Rome? Are they not one in faith so far forth as they are viewed in their essential apostolical character? are they not in discord, so far as their respective children and disciples have overlaid them

with the errors of their own individual minds? It was a great fault, doubtless, that the followers of St. Paul should have divided from the followers of St. Peter, but would it have mended matters had any individuals among them gone over to St. Peter? Was that the fitting remedy for the evil? Was not the remedy that of their putting aside partisanship altogether, and regarding St. Paul, "not after the flesh," but simply as the minister by whom they believed, the visible representative of the undivided Christ, the one Catholic Church? And, in like manner, surely if party feelings and interests have separated us from the members of the Roman communion, this does not prove that our Church itself is divided from theirs, any more than St. Paul was divided from St. Peter, nor is it our duty to leave our place and join them;—nothing would be gained by so unnecessary a step;—but our duty is, remaining where we are, to recognise in our own Church, not an establishment, not a party, not a mere Protestant denomination, but the Holy Church Catholic which the traditions of men have partially obscured,—to rid it of these traditions, to try to soften bitterness and animosity of feeling, and to repress party spirit and promote peace as much as in us lies. Moreover, let it be observed, that St. Paul was evidently superior in gifts to Apollos, yet this did not justify Christians attaching themselves to the former rather than the latter; for, as the Apostle says, they both were but ministers of one and the same Lord, and nothing more. Comparison, then, is not allowed us between teacher and teacher, where each has on the whole the notes of a Divine mission; so that even could the Church of Rome be proved superior to our own (which we put merely as a hypothesis, and for argument's sake), this would as little warrant our attaching ourselves to it instead of our own Church as there was warrant for one of the converts of Apollos to call himself by the name of Paul. Further, let it be observed, that the Apostle reproves those who attached themselves to St. Peter equally with the Paulines or disciples of Apollos; is it possible he could have done so, were St. Peter the head and essence of the Church in a sense in which St. Paul was not? And, again, there was an occasion when not only their

followers were at variance, but the Apostles themselves; we refer to the dissimulation of St. Peter at Antioch, and the resistance of St. Paul to it: was this a reason why St. Peter's disciples should go over to St. Paul, or rather why they should correct their dissimulation?

We are surely bound to prosecute this search after the promised Teacher of truth entirely as a practical matter, with reference to our duty and nothing else. The simple question which we have to ask ourselves is, Has the English Church *sufficiently* upon her the signs of an Apostle? is she the divinely-appointed teacher to *us*? If so, we need not go further; we have no reason to break through the Divine rule of being content with such things as we have; we have no warrant to compare our own prophet with the prophet given to others. And we cannot: tests are not given us for the purpose. We may believe that our own Church has certain imperfections; the Church of Rome certain corruptions; such a belief has no tendency to lead us to any view as to which on the whole is the better, or to induce or warrant us to leave the one communion for the other.

However, there is one point which is so often felt as a difficulty by members of our Church, that we are tempted to say a few words upon it in conclusion, and to try to show what is the true practical mode of meeting it. And this perhaps will give us an opportunity of expressing our general meaning in a more definite and intelligible form. It cannot be denied, then, that a very plausible ground of attack may be taken up against our Church from the circumstance that she is separated from the rest of Christendom; and just such a ground as it would be allowable for private judgment to rest upon, supposing its office such as we have described. As to our peculiar doctrines, it may be urged, Scripture may, if so be, give private judgment little scope; but what can be said to explain away the note of forfeiture attaching to us from our isolated state? We are, in fact, it may be objected, cut off from the whole of the Christian world; nay, far from denying, in a certain sense we glory in that excommunication, and that under a notion that we are so

very pure that it must soil our fingers to touch any other Church whatever upon the earth, in north, east, or south. How is this reconcilable with St. Paul's clear announcement that there is but one body as well as one spirit; or our Lord's, that "by this shall *all men know*," as by a note obvious to the intelligence even of the illiterate and unreasoning, "that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another;" or again, His prayer that His disciples might all be one, "that the world may know that *Thou hast sent me*, and hast *loved them* as Thou hast loved me?" Visible unity, then, would seem to be both the main evidence of our religion and the sign of our spiritual adoption; whereas we English despise the Greeks and hate the Romans, and turn our backs on the Scotch, and do but smile distantly upon the Americans. We throw ourselves into the arms of the State, and in that close embrace forget that the Church was meant to be Catholic; or we call ourselves *the* Catholics, and the local Church *our* Catholic Church; as if, forsooth, by thus confining it all to ourselves, we did not *ipso facto* forfeit for it all claim to be considered Catholic at all.

What increases the force of this argument is, that St. Augustine seems, at least at first sight, virtually to urge it against us in his controversy with the Donatists, whom he represents as condemned, simply because separate from the "orbis terrarum," and styles the point in question "*quæstio facillima*," and calls on individual Donatists to decide it by their private judgment.¹

Now this is an objection which we must honestly say is deeply felt by many people, and not inconsiderable ones; and

¹ "Ego cum audio quenquam bono ingenio præditum, doctrinisque liberalibus eruditum, quamquam non ibi salus animæ constituta sit, tamen in *quæstione facillima* sentire aliud quam veritas postulat, quo magis miror, eo magis exardesco nosse hominem et cum eo colloqui; vel si id non possim, saltem litteris quæ longissime volant [to the nineteenth century?] attingere mentem ejus atque ab eo vicissim attingi desidero. Sicut te esse audio talem virum, et ab Ecclesia Catholica, quæ sicut Sancto Spiritu pronunciata est, toto orbe diffunditur, discreptum doleo atque seclusum."—Ep. 87, vid. ep. 61.

the more it is openly avowed to be a difficulty the better; for there is then the chance of its being acknowledged, and in the course of time obviated, as far as may be, by those who have the power. Flagrant evils cure themselves by being flagrant; and we are sanguine that the time is come when so great an evil as this is cannot stand its ground against the good feeling and common sense of religious persons. It is the very strength of Romanism against us; and unless the proper persons take it into their very serious consideration, they may look for certain to undergo the loss as time goes on, of some whom they would least like to be lost to our Church. If private judgment can be exercised on any point, it is on a matter of the senses; now our eyes and our ears are filled with the abuse poured out by members of our Church on her sister Churches in foreign lands. It is not that their corrupt practices are gravely and tenderly pointed out, as may be done by men who feel themselves sinful and ignorant, and know that we have our own great imperfections, which our brethren abroad have not—but we are apt not to acknowledge them as brethren at all; we treat them in an arrogant John Bull way, as French, or Spaniards, or Austrians, not as Christians. We act as if we could do without brethren, as if our having brethren all over the world were not the very tenure on which we are Christians at all, as if we did not cease to be Christians, if at any time we ceased to have brethren. Or again, when our thoughts turn to the East, instead of recollecting that there are Christian Churches there, we leave it to the Russians to take care of the Greeks, and the French to take care of the Romans, and we content ourselves with erecting a Protestant church at Jerusalem, or with helping the Jews to rebuild their temple there, or with becoming the august protectors of Nestorians, Monophysites, and all the heretics we can hear of, or with forming a league with the Mussulman against Greeks and Romans together. Can any one doubt that the British power is not considered a Church power by any country whatever into which it comes? and if so, is it possible that the English Church, which is so closely connected with that power, can be said in any true sense to exert a Catholic

influence, or to deserve the Catholic name? How can it be even called Catholic, except as acting *out* of its own territory? and when did the rulers of the English Church ever move one step beyond the precincts, or without the leave of the imperial power? *Pudet hæc opprobria*, etc., there is no denying them; and if persons are annoyed at the confession, as if we were thereby putting weapons into our enemy's hands, let them be annoyed more by the fact, and let them alter the fact, and, they may take our word for it, the confession will cease of itself. People do not feel the fact the less for its not being confessed; it *is* felt deeply, and is doing incalculable mischief to our cause, and is likely to hurt it more and more. In a word, this isolation is doing as much as any one thing can do to unchurch us, and it and our awakened claims to be Catholic and Apostolic cannot long stand together. This, then, is the main difficulty which serious people feel in accepting the English Church as the promised prophet of truth, and we are far indeed from undervaluing it, as these remarks show.

But now taking the objection in a simply practical view, which is the only view in which it can really concern or perplex any one, we consider that it can have legitimately no effect whatever in leading us from England to Rome. We do not say no legitimate tendency in itself, but no actual influence on any legitimate ground with serious men, who wish to know how their duty lies. For this reason—because if the note of schism on the one hand lies against England, an antagonist disgrace lies upon Rome, the note of idolatry. Let us not be mistaken here: we are neither accusing Rome of idolatry nor ourselves of schism—we think neither charge tenable; but still the Roman Catholic practises what is so like idolatry, and the English Church makes much of what is so very like schism, that, without deciding what is the duty of a Roman Catholic towards the Church of England in her present state, we do seriously think that members of the English Church have a providential direction given them how to comport themselves towards the Church of Rome, while she is what she is. We are discussing the subject, not of decisive proofs,

or what Aristotle would call τεκμήρια, but of σημεῖα, or presumptive notes of the Divine presence. Few men have time to scrutinise accurately; all men may have general impressions, and the general impressions of conscientious men are true ones. Providence has graciously met their need, and provided for them those very means of knowledge which they can use and turn to account. He has cast around the institutions and powers existing in the world marks of truth or falsehood, or more properly, elements of attraction and repulsion, and notices for pursuit and avoidance, sufficient to determine the course of those who in the conduct of life desire to approve themselves to Him. Now whether or no what we see in the Church of Rome be sufficient to warrant a religious person to leave her (a question, we repeat, about which we have no need here to concern ourselves), we certainly think it sufficient to deter him from joining her; and, whatever be the perplexity and distress of his position in a communion so isolated as the English, we do not think he would mend the matter by placing himself in a communion so superstitious as the Roman, especially considering, agreeably to a remark we have already made, that even if he be schismatical at present, he is so by the act of Providence, whereas he would be entering into superstition by his own. Thus an Anglo-Catholic is kept at a distance from Rome, if not by our own excellences, at least by her errors.

That this is the state of the Church of Rome is, alas! not fairly disputable. Dr. Wiseman has lately attempted to dispute it; but if we may judge from the present state of the controversy, facts are too clear for him. It has lately been broadly put forward, as all know, that whatever may be said in defence of the *authoritative documents* of the faith of Rome, this imputation lies against her *authorities*, that they have countenanced and established doctrines and practices from which a Christian mind, not educated in them, shrinks; and that in the number of these a quasi-idolatry is not the least prominent. Dr. Wiseman, for whom we entertain most respectful feelings personally, and to whom we impute nothing but what is fair and candid, has written two pamphlets on the subject, towards

which we should be very sorry to deal unfairly; but he certainly seems to us in the former to deny the fact of these alleged additions to the formal profession of his Church, and in the second to turn right round and maintain them. What account is to be given of such a change, but the fact that the additions cannot be successfully denied, and therefore must be, at any risk, defended? And that risk is not a small one; for, as if to show that what he adds to his own creed is an addition also to primitive usage, he has in his defence been forced upon citations from the writings of the fathers, the chief of which, as Mr. Palmer has shown, are spurious, thus setting before us vividly what he looks for in antiquity, but what he cannot find there. However, it is not our intention to enter into a controversy which is in Mr. Palmer's hands; rather let us set before the reader some of the melancholy evidences which that learned, though over-severe writer, and Dr. Pusey, and Mr. Ward adduce in proof of the existence of this note of dishonour in a sister or mother, towards whom we feel so tenderly and reverently, and whom nothing but some such urgent reason in conscience could make us withstand so resolutely.

So much has been said on the point lately, as to increase our unwillingness to touch upon a subject in itself very ungrateful; but we are obliged to make one or two extracts from the publications to which we have already alluded, in order to show what is the legitimate use of private judgment, in dealing with those notes of truth and error by which Providence recommends to us or disowns the prophets that come in His name.

Mr. Ward, in the former of his able pamphlets, lays down a distinctive difference between the ancient honours paid to St. Mary and the modern, the modern Roman opinion being "that the Blessed Virgin is appointed by our Lord the *sole necessary channel* through which His grace shall flow to His Church; so that in fact," as he proceeds to observe, "addresses to her are more *immediate* applications for a supply of grace than to our Lord Himself;" and then he refers, in a note, to certain extracts, which Ussher gives from St. Bernardine, and which run as follows in translation:—

“From the time wherein the Virgin-mother did conceive in her womb the Word of God, she had obtained such a kind of jurisdiction, so to speak, or authority, in all the temporal procession of the Holy Ghost, that no creature hath obtained any grace or virtue from God, but according to the dispensation of His holy mother. Because she is the mother of the Son of God, who doth produce the Holy Ghost; therefore all the gifts, virtues, and graces of the Holy Ghost are by her hands administered to whom she pleaseth, when she pleaseth, how she pleaseth, and as much as she pleaseth” (*Bernardin. Senens.*, Serm. lxi. art. i. cap. 8). “She hath singularly obtained of God this office from eternity, as herself doth testify (Proverbs viii. 23): *I was ordained from everlasting*, namely, a dispenser of celestial graces” (*Id., ibid.*, art. iii. cap. 3). “As by the neck the vital spirits do descend from the head into the body, so by the Virgin the vital graces are transmitted from Christ, the head, into His mystical body; the fulness of grace being in Him as in the head, from whence the influence cometh, and in her as in the neck, through which it is transfused” (*Id., ibid.*, num. 2). “Take away the patronage of the Virgin, you stop, as it were, the sinner’s breath, that he is not able to live any longer” (*Viegas., ibid.*, sect. ii. num. 6). “As many creatures do serve the glorious Virgin Mary as serve the Trinity—namely, all creatures, whatsoever degree they hold among the things created, whether they be spiritual as angels, or rational as men, or corporeal as the heavenly bodies or the elements; and all things that are in heaven and in earth, whether they be the damned or the blessed; all which being brought under the government of God, are subject likewise unto the glorious Virgin: forasmuch as He who is the Son of God and of the blessed Virgin, being willing as it were to equal in some sort His mother’s sovereignty unto the sovereignty of His Father, even He who was God did serve His mother upon earth. Whence (Luke xi. 51) it is written of the Virgin and glorious Joseph, *He was subject unto them*; that, as this proposition is true, all things are subject to the command of the Virgin, even God Himself” (*Id., ibid.*, cap. 6).

Mr. Palmer again thus addresses Dr. Wiseman :—

“You will not deny the authority of the litany of the blessed Virgin printed at the end of the Roman Catechism compiled by Cardinal Bellarmine, and to the repetition of which indulgences were attached by Sixtus V., Benedict XIII., and Pius VII. At the conclusion of this is the following prayer :—

“ ‘We fly to *thy protection*, Holy Mother of God, *despise not our prayers* in our necessities, but *deliver us* at all times *from all evils*, glorious and blessed Virgin.’ The holy psalmist placed his trust in God. ‘The Lord will be a refuge for the oppressed, a refuge in times of trouble’ (Ps. ix. 9). He consoled the afflicted of Israel by the hope that the Lord ‘will regard the prayer of the destitute, and not despise their prayer’ (Ps. cii. 17). Our Lord Himself taught us to pray to our Heavenly Father to ‘deliver us from all evil.’ And yet, in spite of all this, the popes grant indulgences for the repetition of prayers which express the very same sort of confidence in the Virgin as the Scriptures teach us to feel towards God.

“I will here mention another prayer to the Virgin, to the repetition of which Pius VI. in 1786 granted indulgences. It is as follows:— ‘Condescend to permit me to praise thee, sacred Virgin. *Grant me strength against thine enemies*. Blessed be God in His saints. The ‘*Stabat Mater*,’ which has indulgences annexed to its repetition by Innocent XI., is full of similar petitions. But I will not dwell further on this branch of the subject.

“You wish for some proofs from your ‘best writers,’ or any of them, that the Virgin Mary is presented instead of the Trinity, and that she is the dispenser of mercy. You will readily admit the eminent learning and piety of Cardinal Bona. Hear, then, the following prayer extracted from his writings:—

“ ‘O most sweet Virgin Mary, Mother of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, *refuge of sinners* and *mother of mercy*, I commit myself this day and evermore to thy peculiar *protection* with most humble devotion. Place me near unto thee, and *protect me from all my enemies visible and invisible*. *Say unto my soul*, I am thy Salvation. Direct me thy servant in all my ways and actions. Console me in all my griefs and afflictions. Defend and preserve me from all evils and dangers. Turn thy face unto me when the end of my life shall come; and may *thy consolation*, in that tremendous hour, rejoice my spirit. *Thou canst do all that thou wilt in heaven and earth, nor can any resist thy will*, for thou obtainest from the Almighty whatever thou seekest. Hear therefore and *receive my prayers*, and despise me not when I confide in thy mercy. Behold *I fall down before thee*, most gracious Virgin, *I fall down and worship* in thee *thy Son*, and I implore thy suffrages to obtain that my sins may be blotted out, to reconcile the heart of thy Son to my heart, that He may possess me, and make a man according unto His heart.’ ”

Again, shortly after

“ Pius VII. by his Rescript of September 21st, 1802, granted a year’s indulgence, applicable to the dead, to every Catholic priest who should recite the following prayer :—

“ ‘ O holy Joseph, guardian and father of virgins, to whose faithful care Christ Jesus, who was innocence itself, and Mary, Virgin of virgins, was committed, I beseech and pray thee by both these dear pledges *Jesus and Mary, to preserve me from all uncleanness and make me ever most chastely to serve Jesus and Mary, with an undefiled mind, a pure heart, and a chaste body. Amen.* (Te per hoc utrumque charissimum pignus Jesum et Mariam obsecro et obtestor, ut me ab omni immunditia præservatum, mente incontaminata, puro corde, et casto corpore Jesu et Mariæ semper facias castissime famulari. Amen.)’
Bouvier, p. 265.

“ In this prayer Joseph is addressed as a *Deity*—a being who has the power of bestowing Divine grace, and of enabling Christians to serve God. The Son of God is made a sort of *Mediator* between Joseph and his worshippers ; and, in fine, the service of Christians is supposed to be divided between Jesus and Mary ! And yet this is a prayer sanctioned by the highest authority in your Church, and unscrupulously published in your most approved practical Treatises on Indulgences.”

And again :

“ His loving patroness, our blessed Lady, rewarded his zeal in the cause of charity and devotion by appearing to him in the sight of an immense crowd of people collected in the church of Foggia, to listen to a discourse upon his *favourite subject*, the intercession and patronage of Mary. From her countenance a ray of light, like that of the sun, was reflected upon the face of *her devout servant*, which was seen by all the people, who cried out a miracle ! a miracle ! and *recommended themselves with great fervour and many tears to the Mother of God* ; and many women of abandoned life were seized with such intense sorrow that they mounted upon a platform in the church, and began to discipline themselves and cry aloud for mercy ; and then leaving the church, retired to the house of penitents in that city. Alphonsus, in his judicial attestation, deposed that during the sermon he, together with the assembled audience, saw the countenance of the blessed Virgin resembling that of a girl of fourteen or fifteen years of age, who turned from side to side, as was witnessed by every one present.

“Whilst he was preaching on the patronage of the blessed Virgin, and exciting his hearers *to recur with confidence to her in all their wants*, he suddenly exclaimed, ‘Oh, you are too cold *in praying to our blessed Lady! I will pray to her for you.*’ He knelt down in the attitude of prayer, with his eyes raised to heaven, and was seen by all present lifted more than a foot from the ground, and *turned towards a statue of the blessed Virgin* near the pulpit. The countenance of our Lady (the statue!) darted forth beams of light, which shone upon the face of the ecstatic Alphonsus. This spectacle lasted about five or six minutes, during which the people cried out, ‘*Mercy, mercy! a miracle, a miracle!*’ and every one burst into a flood of tears. But the saint rising up exclaimed in a loud voice, ‘Be glad, *for the blessed Virgin has granted your prayer.*’”

In like manner Dr. Pusey quotes as follows from Archbishop Ussher:—

“In the crowns composed by Bonaventure, this is one of the orisons that is prescribed to be said: ‘O Empress, and our most kind Lady! by the authority of a mother, command thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that He would vouchsafe to lift up our minds from the love of earthly unto heavenly desires;’ which is suitable to that versicle which we read in the 35th psalm of this Lady’s psalter: ‘Incline the countenance of God upon us—compel Him to have mercy upon sinners,’ the harshness whereof our Romanists have a little qualified in some of their editions, reading thus—‘Incline the countenance of thy Son upon us—compel Him, by thy prayers, to have mercy upon us sinners.’ The psalms of this psalter do all of them begin as David’s do, but with this main difference, that where the Prophet, in the one, aimeth at the advancement of the honour of our Lord, the friar, in the other, applieth all to the magnifying of the power and goodness of our Lady. So in the first psalm: ‘Blessed is the man (quoth Bonaventure) that loveth thy name, O Virgin Mary! thy grace shall comfort his soul;’ and in the others following: ‘Lady, how are they multiplied that trouble me? With thy tempest shalt thou persecute and scatter them. Lady, suffer me not to be rebuked in the fury of God, nor to be judged in His wrath. My Lady, in thee have I put my trust: deliver me from my enemies, O Lady. In our Lady have I put my trust, for the sweetness of the mercy of her name. How long wilt thou forget me, O Lady, and not deliver me in the day of tribulation? Preserve me, O Lady; for in thee have

I put my trust : and impart unto me the drops of thy grace. I will love thee, O Lady of heaven and earth, and I will call upon thy name among the nations.' 'The heavens declare thy glory; and the fragrance of thine ointment is spread among the nations.' 'Hear us, Lady, in the day of trouble; and turn thy merciful face unto our prayers. Unto thee, O Lady, have I lifted up my soul : in the judgment of God, by thy prayers, I shall not be ashamed. Judge me, Lady, for I have departed from my innocency; but because I will trust in thee, I shall not be weakened. In thee, O Lady, have I put my trust, let me never be confounded; in thy favour receive me. Blessed are they whose hearts do love thee, O Virgin Mary; their sins by thee shall mercifully be washed away. Lady, judge those that hurt me; and rise up against them, and plead my cause. Waiting have I waited for thy grace; and thou hast done unto me according to the multitude of the mercy of thy name. Lady, thou art our refuge in all our necessities; and the powerful strength treading down the enemy. Have mercy upon me, O Lady, who art called the mother of mercy, and according to the bowels of thy mercies cleanse me from all mine iniquities. Save me, Lady, by thy name, and deliver me from mine unrighteousness. Have mercy upon me, O Lady, have mercy upon me : because my heart is prepared to search out thy will, and in the shadow of thy wings will I rest. Let Mary arise, and let her enemies be scattered : let them all be trodden down under her feet. In thee, O Lady, have I put my trust, let me never be put to confusion: deliver me in thy mercy, and cause me to escape."

After this and other extracts from divines and devotional writers of past times, Dr. Pusey continues thus—

"It would probably be a first impression on reading these extracts from Archbishop Ussher, that he had with much learning brought together a mass of objectionable language, which it might be hoped was now done away; that all these were the exaggerations of individual minds, and that it was not fair to charge them as teaching now received in the Roman Church. This was my own hope; I reprinted them in illustration of the article, but certainly little thinking of reputing them to Rome at the present day. The contrary, however, of all this is sadly the case. The same extracts which Archbishop Ussher adduced as illustrating the difference between 'the Romish doctrine of the invocation of saints,' and ancient addresses to them, are, in *The Glories of Mary, Mother of God*, by Saint Alphonsus Liguori, and carefully revised by a

Catholic Priest (third edit., Dublin, 1837), adduced as authoritative teaching. The subjects of the early chapters, which they are adduced to establish, are 'how great should be our confidence in Mary, Queen of Mercy' (§ 1), 'as our Mother' (§ 2), 'the great love borne us by Mary our Mother' (§ 3), that 'Mary is *the* refuge of repentant sinners,' and so (§ 4), 'our life, since she obtains us the pardon of our sins' (c. 2, § 1), 'because she obtains us perseverance' (§ 2), 'the *necessity* of Mary's intercession in order to obtain salvation' (c. 5), etc. The sayings of Bernardine of Sienna, Albertus M. Bonaventure, etc., are alleged as authorities. It is still alleged as a true saying, 'All is subject to Mary's empire, even God' (p. 138, see Abp. Ussher, above, p. 196). 'It is not of course to be supposed that no mention should be made of her Son, or from time to time that her intercession is available through her Son, or that Jesus is our Redeemer, Mary our advocate' (p. 88). 'Jesus is my only hope, and after Him, you, O Virgin Mary' (p. 90). One could not imagine anything written by a Christian in entire forgetfulness of his Lord; but these are but scanty; the main object of the work is (as it professes) 'the glories of Mary,' and these are so set forth, as for the most part to end in her, to place her where a Catholic would expect mention of his Lord. Thus at the hour of death, it is said, May I invoke you during life, and die when calling on 'Mary, my Mother, my blessed amiable Mother' (p. 38). To whom again could it be thought that such language as the following is addressed?—

" 'If you grant me your aid, what can I fear? during life and at my death, your name and remembrance shall be the delight of my soul (p. 74). I desire to consecrate myself more particularly to your service, dispose of me according to your good pleasure; direct me; I abandon myself wholly to your conduct; never more let me be guided by myself; chastise me, if I disobey you; your correction will be sweet and agreeable' (Ps. cxli. 5). 'I am then no longer mine, *I am all yours*' (p. 30). 'My sins render me unworthy of approaching you. I should expect nothing but chastisement from your hands. I place in you *all my confidence*, and provided I may be happy enough to die before your image, I shall firmly hope to join in Heaven that innumerable multitude who have been saved by your intercession' (pp. 53, 54). 'How dare a sinner, unworthy as I, appear before you? I am the last of sinners; I have offended the divine Majesty more than any other; since I cannot recall the past, help me to amend the present' (p. 57). 'O consolation of the afflicted! have pity upon me; remorse of conscience gnaws me; my best actions are but imperfectly performed; hell awaits to carry off

my soul ; divine justice must be satisfied ; what then shall become of me ? what shall be my eternal lot ? ' (p. 83). ' He who is protected by you cannot be lost ; heaven and earth confess it. Hence, though all creatures forget me, though the whole world abandon me, provided you forsake me not, I should think myself secure ' (p. 90). ' I cannot abandon myself to despair ; because you are my refuge, and your clemency is unbounded ' (p. 135). ' All power has been given unto you in heaven and in earth ; nothing is impossible to you, for you can give hope to the desponding ' (p. 138)."

Once more ; after noticing the painful assertion in a popular and authoritative work, called the *Treatise on the Scapular*, that St. Mary possesses a "participated omnipotency," Dr. Pusey observes—

" Yet this has been said yet more strongly in *The Glories of Mary*, that she not only 'partakes His omnipotence,' but that He has 'resigned it to her.'

" 'Now the King of Heaven, whose bounty is infinite, desiring nothing so ardently as to confer His favours on us, in order to increase our confidence in Him, has given us His Mother for our mother, and in her hands resigned (if we may say so) His omnipotence in the sphere of grace, that we might place in her the hope of our salvation, and all the hope necessary to attain it ' (p. 85).

" And this power they are fond of representing as belonging to her, not as the creature of whom our Lord deigned to take His nature, but (as before in Archbishop Ussher, pp. 195, 196, 198, 199, 202) derived from her own merit towards her Son, as the result of a debt which He owed her. They are painfully fond of placing her in the same relation as the Father.

" ' Mary owes her Son an infinite gratitude for choosing her for His mother, but it is not less true to say that Jesus Christ has contracted a species of obligation towards her for the human existence He received from her, and in recompense for this benefit, He honours her by hearing her prayers ' (*ib.* pp. 26, 27).

" ' Mary has not spared her own Son, her own soul, for the salvation of many ' (p. 32). If to evince the love of God the Father for man it is said that ' He delivered up His own Son for them ; ' may we not use the same terms to express the love of Mary ? ' Yes,' says St. Bonaventure, ' Mary has so loved us, that she has given us her only Son.' ' She

gave Him us,' says F. Nieremberg, 'when in virtue of her jurisdiction over Him as Mother, she permitted Him to deliver Himself up to the Jews.' 'She gave Him for us—she hath given this well-beloved Son; she sacrificed for us a Son, who was infinitely dearer to her than herself.' 'If our salvation was then so near her heart' (pp. 41-43). 'This Divine Saviour whom she has given to the world' (p. 131). Richard of St. Lawrence beautifully explains this passage (Prov. xxx. 11) in reference to the Holy Virgin. 'The heart of the man of God who trusts in Mary, he shall not want spoils,' 'for she has snatched from hell its prey, to enrich with spoils our Lord Jesus Christ.'

"'In taking flesh in your chaste womb, a God has been pleased to become your debtor, in order to place afterwards at your disposal all the treasures of His unbounded mercy' (p. 144), 'as it was revealed to St. Bridget, Jesus has obliged Himself to grant all the desires and requests of His blessed Mother, not willing to refuse her anything in heaven, since she has refused Him nothing on earth' (pp. 138, 139).

"St. Germanus says to Mary, 'You—O Holy Virgin, have over God the authority of a mother, and hence you obtain pardon for the most obdurate sinners.'

"So that at last it seems nothing strange that she should be introduced as upbraiding an apostate: 'Thou hast renounced *me* and my Son' (p. 136); or that she should be addressed by a penitent, 'I have by my impurity sinned against God and against *thee*' (p. 80); or with the attribute of Divinity, 'Oh, sweet in *communicating* thyself to those that love you, to those that seek you' (p. 193)."

Now what imparts an especial keenness to the grief which extracts such as the above cause in minds kindly disposed towards the Church of Rome, is, that not only are we expressly told in Scripture that the Almighty will not give His glory to another, but it is predicted as His especial grace upon the Christian Church, "the idols He shall utterly abolish;" so that if Anglicans are almost unchurched by the Protestantism which has mixed itself up with their ecclesiastical proceedings, Romanists also are almost unchurched by their superstitions. Again and again in the prophets is this promise given, "From all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you;" "Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols;" "Ephraim shall say, what have I to do any more with idols?"

"I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land." And the warning in the New is as strong as the promise in the Old: "Little children, keep yourselves from idols;" "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels;" and the angel's answer to whom St. John fell down in worship, "See thou do it not, *for* I am thy fellow-servant; worship God."¹

It is, then, a note of the Christian Church, as decisive as any, that she is not idolatrous; and any semblance of idolatrous worship in the Church of Rome as plainly dissuades a man of Catholic feelings from her communion, as the taint of a Protestant or schismatical spirit in ours may tempt him to depart from ours. This is the *Via Media* which we would maintain; and thus without judging Rome on the one hand, or acquiescing in our own state on the other, we may use what we see as providential intimation *to us* not to quit what is bad for what may be worse, not (if so be) to mend schism with idolatry, but to learn resignation to what we inherit, nor seek to escape into a happier state by suicide.

And in such a state of things, certain though it be that St. Austin invites individual Donatists to the Church on the simple ground that the larger body must be the true one, he is not, he cannot be, a guide of *our* conduct here. The Fathers are our teachers, but not our confessors or casuists; they are the prophets of great truths, not the spiritual directors of individuals. How can they possibly be such, considering the subject-matter of action? Who shall say that a point of practice which is right in one man is right even in his next-door neighbour? Do not the Fathers differ from each other in matters of teaching and conduct, yet what fair person ever imputed inconsistency to them in consequence? St. Augustin bids us stay in persecution, yet St. Dionysius takes to flight; St. Cyprian at one time flees, at another time stays. One bishop adorns churches with paintings,

¹ This passage proves, on the one hand, that such worship as St. John offered is wrong; on the other, that it does not unchurch, unless we can fancy St. John guilty of mortal sin.

another tears down a pictured veil ; one demolishes the heathen temples, another consecrates them to the true God. St. Augustin at one time speaks against the use of force in proselytizing, at another time he speaks for it. The Church at one time comes into general council at the summons of the Emperor; at another time takes the initiative. St. Cyprian baptises heretics; St. Stephen accepts their baptism. The early ages administer, the later deny the Holy Eucharist to children. Who shall say that in such practical matters, and especially in points of casuistry, points of the when, and the where, and the by whom, and the how, words written in the fourth century are to be the rule of the nineteenth ? We have not St. Austin to consult; we cannot go to him with his works in our hand, and ask him whether they are to be taken to the letter under our altered circumstances. We cannot explain to him that, as far as the appearance of things go, there are, besides our own, at least two Churches, one Greek, the other Roman; and that they are both marked by a peculiarity which does not appear in his own times, or in his own writings, and which much resembles what Scripture condemns as idolatry. Nor can we remind him that the Donatists had a note of disqualification upon them, which of itself would be sufficient to negative their claims to Catholicity, in their refusal of Catholicity to the rest of Christendom ; and, moreover, in their bitter hatred and fanatical cruelty towards the rival communion in Africa. Moreover, St. Austin himself waives the question of the innocence or guilt of Cæcilian, on the ground that the *orbis terrarum* could not be expected to have accurate knowledge of the facts of the case;¹ and if contemporary judgments might be deceived in regard to the merits of the African succession, yet, without blame, much more may it be maintained, without any want of reverence to so great a saint, that private letters which he wrote fourteen hundred years ago do not take into consideration the present circumstances of Anglo-Catholics. Are we sure, that had he known them, they would not have led to an additional chapter in his *Retractations* ? And again, if ignorance would have been an excuse, in his judgment,

¹ Epp. 93, 144.

for the Catholic world's passing over the crime of the Traditors, had Cæcilian and his party been such, much more in so nice a question as the Roman claim to the *orbis terrarum* at this day, in opposition to England and Greece, may we consider that he who condemned the Donatists only in the case of *quæstio facillima*, would excuse us, even if mistaken, from the notorious difficulties which lie in the way of a true judgment? Nor, moreover, would he, who so constantly sends us to Scripture for the notes of the Church Catholic, condemn us for shunning communions which had been so little careful to clear themselves from what he would have considered, after Scripture, misprision of idolatry. But even let us suppose him, after full cognisance of our case, to give judgment against us; even then we shall have the verdict of St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, and others virtually in our favour, supporters and canonisers as they were of Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, who in St. Augustine's own day lived and died out of the communion of Rome and Alexandria.

We do not think, then, that St. Austin's teaching can be taken as a direction to us to quit our Church on account of its incidental Protestantism, unsatisfactory as such a note is. And, it is pleasant to believe that there are symptoms at this time of its improvement; and we only wish we could see as much hope of a return to a healthier state in Rome, as is at present visible in our own communion. There is among us a growing feeling that to be a mere Establishment is unworthy of the Catholic Church, and to be shut out from the rest of Christendom is not a subject of boasting. We seem to have embraced the idea of the desirableness of being on a good understanding with the Greek and Eastern Churches; and we are aiming at sending out bishops to distant places, where they must come in contact with foreign communions; and though the extreme vagueness, indecision, and confusion in which our theological and ecclesiastical notions at present lie will be almost sure to involve us in certain mistakes and extravagances, yet it would be unthankful to despise the day of small things, and not to recognise in these movements a hopeful stirring of hearts, and a religious feeling after something better than we have. But not to dwell unduly on these public

manifestations of a Catholic tendency, we should all recollect that a restoration of intercommunion with other Churches is, in a certain sense, in the power of individuals. Every one who desires unity, who prays for it, who endeavours to further it, who witnesses for it, who behaves Christianly towards the members of Churches alienated from us, who is at amity with them (saving his duty to his own communion and the truth itself), who tries to edify them, while he edifies himself and his own people, may surely be considered, as far as he himself is concerned, as breaking down the middle wall of division, and renewing the ancient bonds of unity and concord by the power of charity. Charity can do all things for us; charity is at once a spirit of zeal and of peace; by charity we shall faithfully protest against what our private judgment warrants us in condemning in others; and by charity we have it in our own hands, let all men oppose us, to restore to our own circle the intercommunion of the Churches.

There is only one quarter from which a cloud can come over us and darken and bewilder our course. If, *nefas dictu*, our Church is by any formal acts rendered schismatical, while Greek and Roman idolatry remains not of the Church, but in it merely, denounced by councils, though admitted by authorities of the day,—if our own communion were to own itself Protestant, while foreign communions still disclaimed the superstitions of which they are too tolerant,—if the profession of ancient truth were to be persecuted in our Church, and its teaching forbidden,—then doubtless, for a season, Catholic minds among us would be unable to see their way.

JOHN DAVISON, FELLOW OF ORIEL.¹

THE author of the miscellaneous compositions which are now at length collected together in the volume of which we have given the title, may be considered as an instance of the operation of a mysterious law which is often witnessed in the course of human affairs. It is surely mysterious, considering what the world is, how it needs improvement, and moreover that that this life is the appropriate time for action, or, what is emphatically called in Scripture, *work*, that they who seem gifted for the definite purpose of influencing and edifying their brethren, should be allowed to do so much less than might be expected. For instance, no one certainly can duly estimate, it must be admitted, the effect produced by as much as Mr. Davison has been appointed to say and to do; still, left to ourselves, we are apt to grudge that the powers of such a mind as his have not had full range in his age and country, and that a promise of such high benefits should, owing to circumstances beyond man's control, have been but partially accomplished. Here is one of the most original thinkers of his day, deep, serious, reverential, various, suffered to end his course, as it may be called, prematurely; absorbed, moreover, during the greater part of it in employments which, though sacred in their nature and honoured by a special blessing, and zealously fulfilled by him, yet apparently might be left to those who have not his particular endowments; and, as the consequence of those employments, stinted in his apprehension and possession of dogmatic know-

¹ From the *British Critic* of April 1842, suggested by the *Remains and Occasional Publications of the late Rev. John Davison, B.D.*, formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, author of *Discourses on Prophecy*.

ledge, so that what he has written is rather true in principle and admirable in sentiment than complete in system. Here is a man of the cast of Hooker and Butler, fitted to be a doctor of the Church, yet confined pretty much to the first principles of Christian doctrine, and allowed but once or twice to give utterance to the truths on which he lived and to manifest the flame which burned unceasingly within him.

Of course in such cases we may rest quite secure that all is ordered according to the most perfect wisdom, though we do not understand it. But what deserves notice in the case before us is, that the bent and temper of Mr. Davison's own mind did but concur in and carry out this external disposition of things, which we have been noticing, as if within and without one Agent was present, or as if his inner man was instinctively resigning itself to his outward destination. At the time of his death the common report was that he had ordered all his manuscripts to be destroyed; and in the preface to the present collection it is pointedly observed that "nothing hitherto unpublished appears in it." We also learn from the preface that the same feeling has operated to the maintenance of an almost absolute silence about the author's history. It professes to give "the few brief notes of his life, which those who are entrusted with his *Remains* feel to be all that they are permitted here to set down. A memoir greatly more detailed, and so far more satisfactory, might very easily have been compiled. But in this, and in many like particulars, the wishes of those who survive have given way to their decided conviction of what his would have been" (p. iii.).

Moreover, if we may continue our remarks on this subject, it would appear as if there were something even in the outward bearing and demeanour of this revered person which answered the same purpose of concealing from the gaze of the world what he was. We do not write as his friends or acquaintance; he was of a generation before us; we do not write as if in apology or explanation, but we write as thinking him a man of a great mind, and as feeling, we cannot deny, some curiosity and pleasure in contemplating an instance, the more interesting because not uncommon, of the secrecy and solitude in which

great minds move, as if they were calling on the world, if it thought it worth while, to "go out into the wilderness" after them. In the preface to these *Remains* it is observed of their author that "perhaps his whole character might be cast in a mould of severer goodness than this age could easily endure" (p. v.). According to the plaintive though unprosodiacal verses *παῦροι δ' ἀγάσαντο Θουκυδίδην ὀλόρου*, "They that wear soft clothing are in kings' houses." We can conceive such a one, epicurean or academic, refined, fastidious, indolent, spending an aimless life amid society and literary leisure, falling in with the subject of these remarks, and shrinking from the reality of mind which he could not appreciate, and disgusted with the staidness or abruptness which he could.

The confessions of such a poor trifler and dreamer have lately got abroad. "I saw D. the other day in town," says Lord Dudley: "it is quite astonishing that with such an understanding and such acquirements, his manners should be entirely *odious and detestable*. How you could live with him without hating him, I do not understand. Clever as he is, there must be some great defect in his mind, or he would try to make himself a little more sufferable."—*Letters*, p. 58. Of course such a judgment can give pain to no friend of the subject of it. There is something almost ludicrous, when we consider that probably the truth of the matter was that Mr. Davison did not choose to be "hail fellow well met" with such a sort of person, or to show off and play the accomplished before a man of the world. Probably Lord Dudley was very offensive in his own way, and found his match. Of course he would have no perception that this was the case, and feeling that he had been struck by something very hard, would consider, not that he had impinged, but that he had been assailed. Certainly men of reverential and religious tempers are apt to hide them from those who are not worthy of them—nay, it must be confessed, too, they often put on over them a very rough jacket for the special benefit of such persons. The above record, then, on the part of a man who, with all his estimable points, few persons will *respect*, is not one which deserves dwelling on for its own sake; yet it may be taken, not

without profit, as a specimen of the judgments, so often found in history, so often at this day, which the world forms of those who are endeavouring to live within the veil, and to view things as He views them who sees all things as they really are. Men of cultivated minds consider great divines or great philosophers merely in an intellectual point of view, and think they have a right to be admitted to their familiarity, when they meet them. They have no objection to exclusiveness when talent and education, or again when wealth and station are made the tickets of admission; but they are very much disgusted when they find the exclusiveness conducted on quite another principle, that the brotherhood of mind or the talisman of good society avails them nothing, and that in this case they are without, not within, the privileged circle. Till this "odious" and "insufferable" reserve is introduced, they will bear with a great deal in the way of difference, singularity, or, as they call it, even error of opinion. A man, for instance, to take what principally meets our view at this time, may go a great way in Catholic opinions, and will be allowed to say and do what would be considered monstrous in another, if he does but conform himself to the existing state of things, adopt the tone of the world, take his place in the social body, and become an integral member and a breathing and living portion and contented servant of things which perish. But if he will not put an establishment or a philosophy in the place of the Church, if he will not do homage to talent as such, or wealth as such, or official eminence as such, then he is out of joint with the age, and not only his words, but his look and his air are like a pail of cold water thrown over every man of the world whom he meets. Thus, to instance the phenomenon in an extreme case, Hume, as is well known, said he never fell in with a religious man who was not melancholy.

The writer of the preface to the *Remains* makes one remark about Mr. Davison which serves with much appositiveness to illustrate what we have been saying:—

"He always showed himself particularly anxious to favour and befriend all kinds of moral worth, as distinct from mere ability. His pupils knew him to be especially on his guard against the idolising of

intellectual talent or successful study. *He saw nothing admirable in it, except as guided by an energetic sense of duty.*"

This seems written at Lord Dudley by anticipation. The writer proceeds—

"The following extract of a letter is inserted as expressive of this feeling :—' I am cast upon this place ' (Cottersworth), ' by the division of my journey between York and London. It is a great spot, for it has Newton on the right, and Sanderson on the left. My mind turns most to Boothby Pagnel. Newton I can only admire. Sanderson is nearer to imitation, though still far above it. What a delight it is to dwell upon the memory of such a man ! much more would it be to be able to live like him ' " (p. v.).

Here, indeed, the contrast is not between intellectual and moral endowments, but between gifts and practicable acquirements : yet still such is the fact, that Mr. Davison's affections went with the moral endowments, not with the intellectual.

In like manner the following noble passage occurs in his note upon his Sermon on Education :—

" Our civilisation itself, what is it but a speculative or a mechanical phantom, except as it gives larger scope to the exercise of virtue, private, social, or religious ? We might as well be in the woods, where our forefathers were, as in the midst of looms and engines, pictures and libraries, or in the midst of the enjoyments of pleasure or accommodation which these things produce, unless we lift our views to a point of moral elevation above them, and are intent on some better object which the conscience can approve, as the proper aim and business of the responsible creatures of God " (p. 250).

We have got into our subject without such introductory formalities as are usual and befitting, and now it is too late to do more than notice our irregularity. And since the *qualis ab incepto* is always more respectable than inconsistency, we hope to be allowed, as we have began, so to proceed, not without something of arrangement in our own minds, but with not a very perceptible one, and with frequent digressions as they occur, and at last perhaps without any plan or order at all. It will be

recollected that we have been speaking of that economy of reserve and secrecy in which our author seems to have been involved, as other similar minds; and now we will point out another of its secondary causes, or, as they may be called, its phenomena. We mean the difficulty he seems to have had in expressing himself, the consequent effort which, not only composition but even conversation, or we may say speech cost him, and the effect of this visible in his writings.

It would be great presumption, except in one who knew such a person well, to attempt to analyse the reasons in his particular case for this peculiarity, and the manner in which it operated, and we have no sort of intention of incurring it. Yet viewing him not in himself, but, as it were, in the abstract, as a historical portrait, it may be not without its use to set down, not what *were* the reasons, but some of what might be, and what are the reasons of it in similar instances. We suppose, then, that it is undeniable that there are persons whose minds are full of thought even to bursting, in whom it is pent up in a strange way, and when it at last forces itself out in language, it does so with the suddenness, brevity, completeness, and effectiveness (if the comparison be allowed) of a steam-boiler. The more fully formed is the image of truth in the mind, the greater task is it to find door or window for it to escape by, and when it makes egress, perhaps it comes head foremost. Again, minds which vividly realise conclusions, often are irritated at the necessity of drawing out premises; or they are inadequate to the task; or they are impatient of many words; or they are at a loss where to begin; or they despair of conveying their meaning to others; or they find a relief to their feelings in some sudden and strong outbreak. When under such circumstances there is a habit of self-government, and a watchful control of feeling and language, there will often be an abruptness of speech in consequence; or an unseasonable silence; or an uneasy patience, an unaccountable constraint, a composure without repose; or a variable jerking manner, as if a man were riding his horse with a tight rein. Or sometimes, to recur to our former figure, he will let off the steam, in the shape of humour. Or when the mind feels

its own separation from others, its strangeness, its isolation, a distance of demeanour is the consequence, which apparently argues a want of frankness and cordiality, or a recklessness, which may be set down to arrogance or pride. All these feelings are destructive of ease of deportment; to which must be added what is sometimes called *consciousness*, the painful perception of the presence of self, quite distinct from self-importance and self-conceit, though looking like them to indiscriminating eyes.

It will show most plainly that we are not speaking of Mr. Davison personally in these remarks, to draw attention to the gravity and deliberateness which mark all his writings, and in particular to the great patience and exactness with which he draws out principles or doctrines in their elementary state; as in his first lecture on Prophecy, where he carefully analyses some of the first elements of Christian Evidence, while, by apologising for the minuteness of his discussion, he betrays his own feeling that it was tiresome. "To men," he observes, "already satisfied of the truth and the importance of the Gospel, few things are less acceptable than to be recalled from the career of their past conviction, to take up again the original proofs of their faith, and resume the principles of an inquiry which they have had happily answered in the effect of a well-persuaded reason, and a regulated life. To such persons the debate with Scepticism is a tedious and worn-out speculation; their life has outrun the question; they enjoy what we are asking them to believe" (p. 19, second edition).

We consider the characteristic of Mr. Davison's style to lie in the force and vividness of its separate expressions, phrases, or sentences; and, though there is always a danger of generalising beyond our data we are tempted to ascribe these qualities expressly to such constituents of it as we have enumerated, and to state our opinion that he is more happy in his words and clauses than in his conduct of an argument. His style, viewed in its general tenor and substance, is but one of those imperfect manifestations of the inner man which are characteristic of him. He does not *compose* well; there is a want of vigour and skilfulness

in putting his arguments or views out of hand; he is circuitous and unready in the management of his matter, and inelegant in his grammatical constructions. And where this is the case, that very force and richness in the lesser portions of the composition which we would ascribe to Mr. Davison, do but increase of course the appearance of elaborateness, we may even add of heaviness in it, as a whole. They act as weights upon it, not as supports. It may be added, that he may be accused of promising more than he fulfils, and gives us the appearance of dwelling on the style more than on the argument, and of selecting his words and phrases more for the sake of embellishment than of illustration. Nor is it any disparagement of him to say, that in his case his words do sometimes go beyond what they convey, though this at first sight may sound like a paradox; for, in truth, he had deeper thoughts than he could well bring to light; so that his language is rather the index of his meaning than of his sense, of the objects which possessed him, than of the subject-matter which he treated. And again, we may bear to say that his style is laboured in its details; for what is this but to allow that he is so engrossed with realities which are close at hand, and feels it so difficult to shake off their impression, that he is but a second-rate artist in bringing out those broad lights and effects, and in taking those general views, which writers of the day are so successful in accomplishing, at a cost of being sketchy and superficial? We will add, that his apparent negligence in composition is sometimes so great as almost to look like intention. What, for instance, if it be worth noticing, can be more inartificial and ungraceful than the following commencement, literally the first sentences of a sermon delivered, if we mistake not, at an anniversary meeting of some very high persons?—

“In the following discourse I propose, first, to consider these words of the Apostle, as they encourage to active usefulness in life; next to speak of the value and advantage of societies instituted for the furtherance of objects of public utility; and lastly, to advert to some of the peculiar objects which come under the care of your ancient incorporated society.”

—*Remains*, p. 205.

And these separate heads, when entered upon, prove to be so distinct from each other, and entire in themselves, that we are presented rather with three half-finished sermons, preached one after another, than with the *bonâ fide* treatment of a subject, such as we might fairly anticipate on such an occasion. But we shall have more to say about this sermon by-and-by, in a different connection.

We have been speaking of Mr. Davison's unattractiveness in general style, yet felicity in its separate portions, as being a sort of type of that economy of reserve which an unseen hand wrapped round him. Of his talent indeed in the latter it is impossible to speak too highly; the energy of his mind discharges itself calmly, concisely, and forcibly on the matter in hand with the power of artillery directed against a fortress. The beauty of his images, the terseness and truth and freshness of his expressions, in a word their remarkable originality, an originality more remarkable in style even than in matter, give a charm to his discussion which amply compensates for whatever is wanting in its *set*, in the vigour and ease of its movements and the knitting and suppleness of its joints. The mere man of letters will desiderate purity and harmony of language; but Mr. Davison is *sui similis* more than any other religious writer of his day, and, though it is very difficult to analyse what it consists in, there is a certain definite character, one and the same, which all persons will recognise, running through his sayings, his conversation and his writings, which belongs to no one else. If any writer has reason to be turned into a grammatical root, surely as Cicero is the author of Ciceronian Latin, so we may be permitted without offence to call Mr. Davison's style Davisonian. It was probably in allusion to this peculiarity that a French refugee, resident in Oxford in his day, used to say of his language that it was like Minerva, issuing armed *cap-à-pié* from Jupiter's head. No better illustration can be given of it than the short dialogue about truth and accuracy, which for a different purpose is recorded in the preface. It is an instance of a remark, grave and sensible indeed in itself, but striking especially from the manner in which it is conveyed.

“‘That is rather a minute accuracy. But I have a respect for all accuracy, for all accuracy is of the *noble family of truth*.’ ‘*Aus*. And is to be respected accordingly.’ ‘Even to her *most menial servant*’” (p. 10).

Accordingly, few persons seem to have left more of their sayings in the memory of their friends than Mr. Davison; and that quite as much from their being *like* their author, and reminding them of one they loved and admired, as for their extrinsic value. Some of them are in their circumstances of a lighter character. A college servant used to tell a story how, when Mr. Davison in his younger years was pro-proctor, he chased an undergraduate all the way from Magdalen Bridge to the “Star Hotel,” where he caught him; by which time the narrator was, to use a familiar word, completely winded. Mr. Davison, however, was as even in his breathing and sedate in his deportment as before the race begun, and thereupon spoke his first and last words to his captive, “Sir, it has not availed.” One day a pupil burst into his dressing-room full of hope and joy to tell him that the report was that he had got the Newdigate; he replied, “Do you come here, Mr. So-and-so, to occupy me with rumours?” On another occasion he interrupted a rambling reasoner in a low tone, “Stop, stop, you reason uncomfortably.” We hope these instances, which of course only occur at random out of an indefinite number of similar ones, are not beneath the purpose for which we select them, nor are inconsistent with the reverent feelings which we entertain and wish to express towards the subject of them; but they seem to us to have their value, as serving to depict a mind under control, relieving itself briefly and strongly, not without a dash of humour in the expression by way of discharging itself the more safely.

But it is hardly fair to the reader, to say nothing of the claims of our author himself, to record the mere colloquial effusions of a great mind. In order to form a judgment of the terseness, beauty, felicity, and graceful festivity of Mr. Davison’s language, we extract the following *locus classicus*, as it may be called, from his review of Edgeworth’s *Professional Education*. He has told us in a previous page that “in a series of essays Mr

Edgeworth has traced different plans of education, calculated for the wants of the several professions. His plans begin at a very early period, and undertake to regulate the habits, studies, and sometimes the amusements of the boy, in almost every particular, with a view to his civil employment in future life. The advantage to be secured by this concentration of his tastes and studies is the enabling him to fulfil his station well, and enlarge his attainments, as applicable to it " (p. 422).

Presently he illustrates it as follows, from Mr. Edgeworth, in the passage to which we call attention.

" Instead of making well-educated men, the object of his system is to make pleading and prescribing and other machines. So far does he carry the subdivision of his relative aims, that the knowledge of the first and plainest truths of religion is made to belong to a particular profession. The little uncassocked clergyman, of six years old, is to be made acquainted with the being of a God, in a proper philosophical way. But his lay-brothers have no such regular instruction provided for them. It is no part of their business. They must recollect that they are not designed for the Church, and follow their proper profane studies. Who knows but that they may live to hear their brother in the pulpit, and get some religion from him there ?

" The lawyer is to have his appropriate management as soon as he begins to speak. A nurse of good accent is to be procured for him, to modulate his first babblings in the right tone of the bar. He is to prattle for a fee. He is afterwards to be encouraged to a little ill-bred disputatiousness for the same worthy purpose. Mr. Edgeworth quotes a trite passage of Roman history to show that the Romans bestowed much care upon the elocution of their children, and repeats over again the tale of Cornelia and the Gracchi. The Romans thought it a grace in their children to speak their own language well. So thinks every one. The peculiarity of Mr. Edgeworth's mind consists in making it exclusively a lawyer's accomplishment.

" The physician that is to be, as soon as he can wield a spade, is to have his garden in imitation of the great Sir Charles Linnæus, and vex the ground with his botanical arrangements. The culture of opium and rhubarb will be his first step to the prescription of them.

" The infant soldier is to be made a hero as soon as possible. Indeed no time is to be lost with him, for Mr. Edgeworth recommends that he

be accustomed to the presence of domestic animals without terror, 'and be taken to the exhibitions of wild beasts that he may be familiarised to their forms and cries.' His nurse too must be chosen for her aptitude to the duties of rearing a great captain. When the defender of his country is grown up to a boy, his sports should be of the military cast. Without making too much parade, he should begin to work upon some fortification in the corner of a shrubbery. He must be trained also to a sense of honour, and abhor the disgrace of corporal punishment as a soldier ought.

"Such is the grand scheme of partition to be made among the professional aspirants according to their destinations of future life. Religion, a good elocution, gardening and other amusements, a manly constitution of body and mind, and a tenderness of honour, we have always thought to be good for boys as sensitive rational beings capable of instruction, health, and pleasure. To make cunning sport for them, and defraud them of the natural right of amusing themselves in their own way, does not agree with our feelings of kindness for them. It sophisticates them in the very point where they should be most free and natural. But to delegate the moral qualities, such as a just impression of religion and a right sense of honour, to a station or title, or a piece of cloth, or to make the slightest difference in these respects, is to confound the essence of morality and run deliberately insane upon a spurious conceited wisdom" (pp. 452-454).

We suggest the following extract from the author's *Observations on the Criminal Law* to all examiners for fellowships and scholarships as a good passage for translation into Latin:—

"In different stages of society there will be a succession of new crimes to exercise the vigilance of the law; and the general habits and state of the times cannot vary faster than the vices produced or fostered by them. In a ruder age, the violent crimes will prevail; in a more civilised one, the meaner. We rather believe, however, that in a rude age there is much violence and baseness joined together, as none are more addicted to theft and sordid cunning than savages; but atrocities throw the humbler vices into the shade, and cause them to be less felt in their own age, and less known in another. Commerce itself, however, is the fruitful mother of the crimes of theft in all their varieties, not more from the habits it bestows than the opportunity it affords to that offence. It pours in wealth in a shape the most convenient

for plunder. The rural opulence of our forefathers was not completely safe; still, their oaken tables and their wheat ricks could not be carried off without some trouble, and men were honest because property was immovable. But when commerce has collected together the enjoyments of life, and given to more men the taste than the means of them, dishonesty is whetted by all it sees, and by the ease of invading it. We need not wonder at the activity of theft when we look at the accumulated riches of a metropolis, crowded with shops and houses overflowing with loosely guarded plenty—shops where trade thrives so well that the owner cannot attend to his customers and the thief at the same time, and houses where the display of wealth is more a fashion than the economy of it. In Newgate biography, perhaps, examples might be found of a man's setting out perfectly honest at the one end of Cheapside and becoming fit for a prison before he reached the other. The circulating force which keeps property constantly afloat, and ready to fly at a touch, places it equally in the way of traffic and of pillage. To be ready to be sold, it must be ready to be stolen. To protect all this plenty, and especially in its less divisions, the law is called upon to exert its power. The small proprietor, indeed, could hardly be called the owner of what he enjoys but for the strong hand of the law. His inventories and title-deeds would be nothing without the statute-book" (pp. 496-498).

We have already alluded to Mr. Davison's images; they are severe, yet graceful; just and natural, yet poetical. They are introduced into the gravest discussion, yet without any detriment to its keeping. For instance, Mr. Edgeworth is for settling every one's profession in his cradle, as we have seen, which he considers, to use his own words, "in a family where there are more sons than one, would prevent all injurious competition. As all the brothers would early know that they were to pursue different modes of life, there could never be any crossing interests or jealousy of particular talents, *though there might and ought to be among them an emulation of general excellence.*" Mr. Davison observes upon the hint thrown out in the last words—

"A more unlikely method of inspiring emulation, or leaving any scope for it, we can hardly conceive, than a complete separation, at an

early age, of every feeling and pursuit among them. It is like setting horses on their speed against each other, by running them on different grounds that they may not jostle " (p. 418).

In a later part of the same paper he observes :—

"To make the connection of them (the liberal studies) with the immediate technical business of any profession apparent is no part of our manner of arguing. If they cherish and invigorate the mental powers, it is enough. When the tide flows strong in the main sea we shall never doubt but it will, in due time, fill every channel, creek, and harbour " (p. 444).

In his review of the charges of the *Edinburgh Review* against Oxford and the controversy which they occasioned, he speaks of the fallacy of making the university examinations in the last century the measure of what was taught in Oxford, when "everything of importance, in the way of examination, and by far the greatest part in the way of instruction, was done," whether rightly or wrongly, "within the walls of each particular college, and could be seen only there." This takes him to the image contained in the last extract for a fresh illustration :—

"When the reviewer is disposed to propagate the belief that either the subjects or the state of learning in the place were to be judged of by those open examinations, mere relics of form, he proceeds upon what we know to be a most gross historical mistake ; and a person might as well record the rise of the tide by measures taken on a shore which the sea had abandoned " (p. 364).

Presently he pursues the subject thus :—

[The review] "enters upon a train of reflections which suppose all along the existence of some forms or statutes at Oxford at this day in force, to 'chain down the mind and check inquiry.' Acquitting the critic of unfairness, we cannot so easily acquit him of palpable false reasoning about forms and statutes. These things may be of very little efficacy, to do either good or harm. If the public mind is not conformable to them they are virtually abolished while they subsist. So it was in Oxford, according to the author's statement, that 'the new doctrines were received and taught' in the face of the old exercises :

that is, the genius of the place was not so feeble but that it could carry a few links of the old chain about it after it had sprung into liberty" (p. 371).

These illustrations are sufficient for the purpose which has led us to cite them; but there are others of a different kind introduced, as if rather for his own refreshment and recreation in the midst of a dry discussion than for the sake of the subject. Sometimes they have a character of grave humour; sometimes they are almost eccentric. The Edinburgh Reviewer had been labouring to show that what he considered in a former publication to be *beyond* the elements of mathematics might be included *within* those elements by the time at which he was then writing. Mr. Davison uses a figure quite his own on the occasion;—not to confute a quibble, but to vent his disdain of it.

"The idea of a floating boundary, which is included in that criterion, is rather exceptionable; but, granting it, still we cannot suppose that science has made such a flight during the last six years, active as it has been, that conic sections, which Professor Playfair in 1804 ranked beyond the elements, should now be considered as only 'elementary.' Does the boundary of the elements advance so rapidly? Let the empire abroad be extended in all quarters; but we do not wish, upon every new conquest, to have the *pomeria* put in motion" (p. 369).

In his "Considerations on the Poor Laws," a matter-of-fact subject, if any other, in the midst of a grave paragraph, he suddenly breaks out into the vivid and energetic image contained in the following extract, which is almost as startling, where it occurs, as if in the middle of a college lecture he had attempted to fulfil it in his own person.

"At the same time, projects of amendment have no right to be very sanguine in the extent of their aims. For the particular interests of the country, which are the most nearly affected by the constitution of our poor laws, are by no means beholden to those laws for all the injury or benefit of which they are capable. We must not suppose, therefore, that, if those interests were set as completely at ease as the most satisfactory removal of all that is objectionable in those laws could set them, they would immediately pass at once into a state of extraordinary high

order, vigour, and perfection, *like so many smooth spheres, spinning on their axes, in free space, along the national ecliptic.* This is no more than a truism, resulting from the complexity of all such affairs; and I mention it," etc., etc. (p. 569).

This extraordinary *capriccio* has brought to our minds a reminiscence of Bishop Butler, which, we believe, is a tradition at Stanhope, and may, for what we know, have before this got into print—viz., that he was a very hard rider. Cannot we trace something of a common cause in these two similar minds, grave, contemplative, reserved, profound, between the violent exercise of the one and the sallies of wit in conversation or in writing of the other?

If the reader is tired of these specimens, it is because we have no business to transplant them out of their proper soil, into, as it were, a nursery garden, where they lose their meaning; yet, at the risk of this damage, we are tempted to give one more, and it shall be the image of a tree, and that growing out of the rock of that same dry essay on the Poor Laws. He is contrasting the National Debt with the then poor-law system:—

"It is quite possible for a very opulent country to be most seriously shaken, and disturbed by obstructions and embarrassments in the balance of a sum, or the making up of a debt, which may be absolutely insignificant in comparison of its whole opulence. It makes a vast difference, whereabouts in the sum of its public affairs, that difficulty of balance or debt may happen to rest. If it affects the first sources of supply, if it cramps and disorganises the system of the labour of the country, by converting labourers into mere spenders and consumers, the real detriment produced by it is infinitely greater than it would be if there be a defalcation from its means to the same nominal extent in any other part of its system. . . . A nation would better afford to owe its stockholders five times the amount. It eats, in fact, like a canker, at the root of our resources, for the labour of the kingdom, with its myriads of working hands, is that fibrous root which extracts for us the first element of our growth and sap of circulation. If this root of labour makes its way, and can strike its last fibres freely, the timber will thrive in its strength of trunk and pride of branch and foliage; if it does not, the finest suns and rains over head will not be able to make the plant

grow. It is commonly said of the palm-tree, that no weight laid upon its head can kill it. I have not heard whether naturalists have made the other experiment upon that indestructible species, but I should suppose that a much smaller force would be sufficient to do it a serious mischief at the root" (pp. 566, 567).

We have above remarked on the inequality of excellence between the course of Mr. Davison's composition and his separate sentences and phrases. Some of the above extracts, especially the two first and the last, may seem to disprove this distinction, and, as has already been remarked, it is true that he is at one time far more successful than at another. He sometimes writes without effort, and at another he is like an Atlas with the world on his shoulders. We supposed at first that this was owing to increasing expertness in composition, and that his last writings were his more vigorous and well compacted; but this is by no means the case. His Review of Mr. Edgeworth's *Professional Education*, the best sustained and most self-possessed, is also one of the earliest which the volume contains. His *Inquiry into the Origin of Sacrifice*, not to say his *Lectures on Prophecy*, which, eloquent as they are, can neither of them be called easy compositions, were published thirteen or fourteen years later. In truth, it is very plain that the *subject* was the cause of the difference; and so we think it will be found respecting him generally, that according as he approaches religious topics, his power of sustaining an argument flags, and his course becomes impeded; but as soon as he has no overshadowing awe to subdue him, he is able again to write with vigour and grace. Hence his occasional sermons, though very valuable in point of matter, are some of his least satisfactory specimens of style. Again, his "Essay on Baptismal Regeneration," which appeared as a review, begins at a distance from its subject, and with an elasticity of step which is just the quality we generally desiderate in him; but he loses it page by page as he gradually comes to walk amid sacred truths and solemn arguments. We shall quote the opening as a rare specimen of what may be called *momentum* in style; it has all the weight of Johnson, with a lighter, more springy, tread.

“ . . . We wish openly to disavow the officious service of labouring for an accommodation of opinion between persons who may have their reasons for avoiding all approaches to it. Because, first, we cannot pretend to the authority which ought to go along with the assumption of such an office; and next, not being willing to concede any part of our own belief, we will adopt no principle of accommodation between others, except the firm and temperate statement of our opinions, which could be conciliatory only just so far as the grounds of them are convincing; and lastly, we are well aware that nothing is less welcome to persons strongly engaged in a debate, than the neutrality of a peacemaker, who is likely with many to provoke the anger he would disarm, by his suspected censure of it. And therefore, as we have no special call, in our pages, to this offensive and ungracious moderation, we request that we may not incur the prejudice and evil report of it with any description of men. . . .

“Controversy, when it is carried on in the sound and manly spirit of investigation, is so favourable to the advancement, or the more firm establishment of our knowledge, that we shall never presume to check or decry it. While it is so conducted, religion is only more securely rooted by its friendly violence. Indolent and implicit knowledge is roused by it to a more honest discipline, and error flies before it. In some degree of animation, inspired perhaps more by the ardour of conflict in discussion, than by the exact unprejudiced concern for the subject, should insinuate itself, we still should regard that accident as a venial one, which may render the advocates on either side more alert, and quicken their research without perverting their principles of judgment. The more severe and jealous accuracy which we must be contented often to take from personal feelings, may in the end produce that best of all results, a more certain and a better-reasoned apprehension of the truth. In this light our infirmities may serve us better than our duties. They may give us a vigour of research which those more tardy motives might fail to supply, for we never hail the progress of truth so much as when we hope ourselves to share her triumph.

“The tendency which controversy has, however, at the same time, to overstep these limits, and at once to destroy charity and perplex the truth, is a topic which we do not mean now to enlarge upon. Without adverting to so great an evil, it must be confessed that while even the more moderate warfare lasts, the truth itself is not unfrequently a sufferer:—we do not mean from the mistakes or injudiciousness of the parties, which is too palpable a thing to be noticed, but from the temper

of the public mind, as affected by the existing controversy. The direction of thought, at such a moment, is all turned towards the field of warfare, and not to the valuable interest to be decided upon it. It is intent upon the proceedings of the debate more than the doctrine at issue. It becomes controversial by habit, a temper most adverse to the love and improvement of that very treasure of doctrine, for the sake of which all are so hotly engaged ; as no ground is less cultivated than that which is the scene of present and active hostilities. Nor is it uncommon to see many, who, having ranged themselves on the one side or the other, with a very imperfect knowledge of the reasons and merits of the case, make up in feeling what they want in information, and studiously aggravate the state of suspicion and unfriendliness in order to meet the need of being zealous opponents in a public and important cause" (pp. 280-282).

Such is the vigour and exactness of his gait when his mind is at ease ; but in proportion as it becomes anxious, serious, or abstracted, and

" Ajax strives some rock's vast weight to throw,
The line too labours and the words move slow."

An intimate friend of Mr. Davison's was once asked what he considered was Mr. Davison's habitual and ruling idea. It was at the time when his Visitation Sermon, preached at St. Helen's, Worcester, which is reprinted in this volume, had just made its appearance. The individual in question took it up and turned to the page in it in which the following sentence occurs, and put his finger upon the words which we have printed in italics—

"A clergyman's virtue . . . consists not in singularities. All Christian excellence is in great and substantial duties; in the doctrines of faith cordially embraced and applied ; in the love of God ; in charity to man ; in temperance, in integrity, in humility ; in the control of the appetites and desires ; in prayer and other exercises of piety ; *in the fixed love and admiration of heavenly things*" (p. 269).

We should say that Mr. Davison's writings abundantly confirm this testimony—if we understand it to ascribe to him, as we consider was meant, as his special characteristic, an awful contemplation of the *providential dealings of God with man*. This is

the occupation in which he is engaged through his greater works, and to which we find him drawn even amid subjects of secular interest. His *Discourses on Prophecy* and *Inquiry into the Origin of Sacrifice* are but simple exercises of this habit of mind, and it manifests itself again and again in the occasional sermons and essays of which the volume before us mainly consists. It is remarkable, there is very little dogmatic teaching in his writings, as in the case of Bishop Butler's; vast as is the store of holy meditations which the articles of the faith provide, and essential as they are to all Christian life, yet these were not the characteristic subjects of either the Bishop or Mr. Davison. But they each seem to have been absorbed in the vision of the scheme of religion natural and revealed, of the divine judgments, the divine ways, the divine works, and at this great sight, the latter, not to speak of Butler, seems, somewhat after the pattern of the man greatly beloved, to have "set his face towards the ground and become dumb."

We find, for instance, in the sermon from which a quotation has just been made, an enumeration of the parts of Christian knowledge, which, both in the selection made, and the relative prominence given them, is remarkably illustrative of the turn of his mind.

"And here, if I did not hasten to a conclusion, I might enter upon an inviting subject, in descanting upon the excellence and intrinsic pleasure of Christian knowledge, with its kindred pursuits, whatever they may be. The mystery of our redemption; the dispensations of God; the economy of His all-wise governing Providence; the life, death, doctrines, and mercies of the holy Jesus our Saviour; our own moral nature; our duties; the prospects of our future immortal state; the history of the Church of Christ in its brighter and its darker periods; the fortunes of its propagation; with the lives of its pastors, sages, and martyrs: these are subjects for which other literature can furnish no equivalent in dignity of character, and which, if cultivated, will yield to none in point of interest to our feelings. No good reason, therefore, can be assigned why our taste should be directed, by preference, to other studies, even if motives of duty did not intervene to decide our choice" (p. 275).

In like manner his Assize Sermon on the text, "For rulers are not a terror," etc., begins by reminding us that "our own nature and the scene of life around us" are "equally the subject of divine revelation, and the improvement of the one" is "designed by every light thrown upon the constitution of the other" (p. 180); and proceeds in a similar strain, speaking presently of our being able "to perceive the agency of a divine appointment in the affairs of men, deterring and restraining crime, supporting its first efforts of virtue, and providing for a system of improvement and discipline among men, by the very frame of society itself, by sanctions temporal as well as eternal, the terror of the first being only a present, unsettled anticipation of the other" (p. 189). In his sermon at Deptford he finds his favourite subject on the sea, and breaks out into a meditation, which we are prompted from its beauty to transfer to our pages.

"Its [this world's] intercepting seas were meant to provoke his enterprise; its divided climates and countries to diversify his enjoyments and his arts for obtaining them. The dispersion of his kind was thus counteracted by the bonds of a mutual communication. The works of God were to be seen and known in the great waters. And how rich and various in its stores is this world made, to create the desire, invigorate the faculties, and reward the labour of that master being who has received for a time the delegated possession of it! Sea and land yield him their increase. Productions are removed to a distance to be recommended by their cost and peril of acquisition; the whole society of the species consolidated by the intervention of a mutual want, and the variety of a partial privation; and many wholesome qualities of morals and understanding, with the general circulation of arts and knowledge growing out of the meaner pursuits, which are secured in their activity by the progressive demands of our mere physical nature. The worse is here made to serve the better part; for that some may eat the fruit or wear the clothing of foreign lands, what labour and skill to be laid out in the attempt, and how richly freighted does the vessel return, in experience, in discovery, in information, in the value of hardships patiently endured, and of dangers bravely encountered. And this commerce of the world is daily becoming an object which the wise and good man may contemplate with the greater pleasure, as he sees it purged of one evil

which an inveterate avarice had long been permitted to reckon among its acquired possessions" (pp. 216, 217).

To this "fixed love and admiration" of the providences of Almighty wisdom we trace many of the characteristics of Mr. Davison's writings. One is that embarrassment and constraint to which we have already referred, and which is analogous to what a subordinate feels every day when told to do a thing in the presence of superiors. If we consider how awkward a young person or a schoolmaster feels when bid to catechise when his instructor or employer is by, or the anxiety and distrust of self with which a well-conducted child undergoes an examination, we shall have some insight perhaps into the diffidence and fear with which Mr. Davison touches on sacred subjects. Again, it seems to have led him to elaborate embellishment of style from the feeling with which devout persons spend time, thought, and substance on the decoration of churches. There is often an evident prolonged dwelling on the subject on which he is speaking, or the low tones of a yearning affection, or a beating of heart, or a glow of delight, or an importunate exhibition, or a simple earnest statement, which show how it is with him within. Of course it is very difficult to show this in isolated passages detached from the context, and chosen by the arbitrary feeling and taste of individual critics, yet we will attempt, even at this risk, to convey what we mean to the reader, leaving it to him, when he has once entered into our view, to find more apposite passages for himself, and not doubting that he will enter into it.

Sometimes, as in the following extract, his deep thoughts make him eloquent, not constrained; but the principle is the same.

"Sacred religious knowledge," he says, in a sermon from the notes of which we made our opening extract, "if it feed not the flame of a holy and obedient life, is vain and unprofitable like the rest. For what is knowledge? Evil spirits have it, and in great perfection. Bad men may have it. But the soul actuated by its knowledge to obedience, and governed by this divine principle of the love of God, this it is which is the glory of saints, and which peoples heaven, and turns the schools

of education into nurseries of God's Church, and does His work in the world, and makes the world and His Church to be the nurseries of His eternal kingdom" (p. 236).

Again, the following passage brings to remembrance that calm, tender, eager, wistful, unearthly tone, which is characteristic of a very different author of a very different age—St. Cyprian :—

"The devout apprehension of God is better than the unhallowed speculation of His works. . . . All other knowledge, if unaccompanied with this, or not ministering to it, is but a learned ignorance, a stir and curiosity after shadows and trifles. For God, and our duty, and our last end, and the doctrines of salvation and humility which illuminate the Christian faith, are the greatest things that we can know, and the highest objects upon which we can exercise our understanding" (p. 234).

In the sentences with which he concludes his *Origin of Sacrifice*, we find the same contemplative spirit, the same affectionate reverence for the saints of other days, the same solemn waiting for the future, which have appeared in some former extracts.

"Of the first generations of men, and of their faith and piety, a brief memorial is all that remains. We might wish to see further into the lives and notions of the progenitors of our race, but the wish is denied to us; and our researches in that line must rest where the only authentic record terminates our view. But this memorial of the Old World, brief as it is, is not insufficient to the ends of a Christian's contemplation. 'Abel was a righteous man, and God testified of his gifts;' and 'Enoch walked with God, and God took him;' and 'Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generations.' These are the great relics of piety and virtue, spared to us out of the ruins of time and the Deluge. They are monuments which perpetuate the names of those servants of God from the beginning of things, and occupy the annals of His Church beyond the Flood with an imperishable inscription to their memory. We do not look back into the distant antediluvian scene as to a dreary void. We find there the instances of their approved faith and obedience, and therein a bond and a motive to our sympathy of communion with them.

"If their information, in the method of their redemption and ours, was less, whilst they remained upon earth, than was given to some later

ages, perhaps by this time the defects of it have been supplied, and its measure made complete. But if not opened to them already, the full revelation of that mystery, we know, is only delayed. It is only deferred till the time arrives which shall symmetrise all irregularities of faith and knowledge; when the Church of God of every age shall be but 'one general assembly,' and 'the spirits of just men made perfect,' being gathered to the holy Jesus, 'the mediator of the new covenant,' shall receive the completion of whatever has been wanting in their faith, by a direct illumination from the Fountain of Light" (pp. 162, 163).

To make one more extract, in illustration of the point under review: who does not discern in the following passage that same devout sedulous earnestness to offer one's best to the divine honour, which is so well understood in regard to the oblations and dedications of pious opulence?

"The doctrine of the Gospel had been revealed, and not revealed. It was dark with the excess of the mystery, till it shone in the person of the Saviour; in Him was seen 'the fulness of grace and truth.' For then was come the time when the plan of grace and redemption was to be revealed by being accomplished, and the doctrines of it to be made explicit objects of faith. These doctrines were no more to be wrapped in figure, nor taught by the tongue of prophecy, which spoke the secrets of heaven to earthly ears, and represented things which the eye had not yet seen. They were things too precious to lie buried any longer, like gold in the Indian mines, to ripen against a distant day; or to shine darkly, as jewels at the bottom of the great deep, the abyss of God's counsels. They were brought forth in their lustre, and planted, where they now are seen, on the forehead of the evangelical revelation. Thus we receive the completion of type and of prophecy, and the luminous crown of Christian faith" (pp. 156, 157).

The reverence which Mr. Davison's writings show toward sacred subjects, they also pay in free and ungrudging measure to the institutions and the persons whereby he had learned the knowledge of them. We do not augur much good of any one who does not in the first instance throw himself into the system under which he has been born, accept the voices of the teachers, divines, and pastors by which he is providentially surrounded as the voice of Heaven, and identify their pattern and their faith

with the holy doctrine which they have been the instruments of conveying to him. Of course, such implicit confidence cannot last in all cases, as time goes on, for there is but one truth, whatever it is, whereas there are "many kinds of voices in the world;" and it is not to be anticipated that all minds everywhere, as they grow, will just happen felicitously to concur in the respective system in which they find themselves. And moreover, as regards the multitude of sects, there can be no loyal attachment to them on the part of their individual members, seeing they do not call for it, they provide no object for its exercise. So far from it, their very principle commonly is, that every one is as able to judge as another, that every one should follow his own judgment, and that he is narrow-minded and superstitious if he does not. However, in any orderly Christian community, established, of long standing, with ranks and offices, with a succession of divines, and with a traditionary body of doctrine, that is, any community which *asks* for our allegiance and trust, that heart and mind must be in a very unsound state, which does not from the first, without formal deliberation, but spontaneously and generously, accord it. Certainly with such a temper Mr. Davison would appear to have no sort of sympathy, which is the more remarkable, for he is just such a person as, from his peculiar manner of writing and speaking, a superficial observer might have set down as a man of what is called "original mind," that is, one who despises all who have gone before him, and employs himself in framing new truths expressly for the benefit of the nineteenth century. On the contrary, we suppose scarcely a writer can be produced, who in the same compass, we will say in the volume before us, a thick one, but still only one, and of which two hundred pages are on politics, economy, and law, has introduced, in one way or other, a respectful mention or eulogy of so many of our writers, and that of different schools. Never certainly was an author further removed from "setting up for himself" than the subject of these remarks. He speaks of Hooker's as "a great judgment, with which I reckon it almost a pledge of the truth of any opinion to agree" (p. 111); "of the incomparable Bishop

Taylor," "the high authority of his mind and reason, which is as great as any can be," and "his freedom and strength of thought," and "his immortal work, the 'Ductor Dubitantium'" (p. 30); presently of "the services of Hooker's great and capacious mind, the eloquent wisdom of Taylor, and the patient and laborious learning of the excellent Hammond" (p. 96); of his "affection to the memory, and respect to the orthodox learning, of Hammond" (*ibid.*); of Sanderson, in the language which has already been quoted; of Bacon, as "an author whom it is much safer to take as an authority than to attempt to copy" (p. 441); of "our own virtuous and learned Bishop Bull, whose mind was much nurtured in the sentiments of the primitive Church" (p. 260); of Tillotson, as one of "our best divines" (p. 345); of Burke, as "our immortal statesman, whose eloquence is inferior only to his more admirable wisdom" (p. 442).

This characteristic in Mr. Davison will go far to account for certain opinions or avowals which we find in his writings, and in which it is very obvious that we ourselves, for instance, should be unable to follow him. He put himself, as it were, into the hands of the authors he respected. A friend of his and ours was once asked, "Why Mr. Davison did not attempt the interpretation of the Apocalypse?" he answered, that Mr. Davison had expressed to him that overwhelming sense of Mede's powers, which made it seem quite presumptuous in him to attempt it after him. And accordingly in his discourse upon "The Prediction of the Great Apostasy," we find him speaking of the system contained in the Apocalypse as having given "scope to the exercise of Mede's capacious understanding." Probably we owe to Mede, not only what he did not write in way of comment on the Apocalypse, but in a measure what he did; though doubtless the Warburton foundation was the chief cause of his committing himself to the theory to which we allude, viz., that the prophecies concerning Antichrist have been fulfilled in the Church of Rome. Indeed, he was bound by the very Lecture which gave occasion to his Discourses to take this side of the controversy; and the following passage with which he introduces his contribution to it is sufficient to suggest how

much he may have been unconsciously biassed by his deference to the authority which exacted it of him.

“As the distinguished prelate, the founder of this lecture, had it in view, as one object of his institution, to enforce a special reference to those parts of prophecy which will fall within my present discourse, by bringing them under your notice I shall comply with that his particular design, and at the same time prosecute the inquiry into the use and inspiration of the Scripture oracles, which I have wished to follow in a settled course and order, and with a more extended view. As to this one subject of prophecy, on which his mind was intent, he has not only prescribed it to others, but he has cultivated it himself, and that with so much strength of reason, and eloquence of discussion, in one of those learned and argumentative discourses which he delivered in this place, that the author has in a manner surpassed the founder, by anticipating, in this argument at least, with so much skill and success, the purpose of his institution.”—*Prophecy*, Discourse X.

It will be observed that the author here says that it was “*one object*” of Warburton to secure lectures against the Church of Rome, whereas the words of the endowment, we believe, speak of lectures “to prove the truth of revealed religion in general, and of the Christian in particular, from the completion of the prophecies of the Old and New Testament, which relate to the Christian Church, *and especially* to the apostasy of papal Rome.” We believe we are correct in saying, that in the great controversy between the Roman and Anglican divines in the reign of Charles II. and James II., the topic of Antichrist was never brought forward; its revival is due to Bishops Newton, Warburton, and Hurd, men of not very serious or spiritual minds, in the middle of the following century.

There is another eminent person for whom he has a great respect, and to whose memory we should be unjust if we did not mention it—Bishop Jewel. We should recommend the passage to the special notice of the excellent and universally esteemed divine who is reported to have in preparation the works of that celebrated man, were we not sure he was already well acquainted with it; and we should do so from a feeling that parties im-

peached ought always to have every possible advantage given them, and from an entire readiness that, if testimonies to character are found to avail in what is a question of fact, Bishop Jewel should have the benefit of a witness so very different in mind and temper from himself. And we have another reason; for Mr. Davison's testimonial is drawn up in such very choice and significant language, that, even were we disposed to be unfair, we should not have the heart to pass over what is as pregnant in meaning as beautiful in expression.

“Had all the serious and learned divines of our Church to give their voice in favour of the one man whom they would hold forth as the greatest light of the Reformation—as the person whose mind had most fully comprehended and laboured upon the whole compass of reformed truth, and whose writings do still preserve the most highly sanctioned memorial of it;—we know not whether they would name any other than him, who, having received from the great fathers of the Reformation the office of unfolding, complete in all its parts, that truth which they with their faithful voices had proclaimed among us, first reduced and recorded our whole national creed with its illustration and evidence—Bishop Jewel. He, with a more leisurely survey of the bearing of every doctrine than could be taken even by the leading reformers themselves, who, in the first effort and agony of their work, with rude and noble simplicity, threw down the fabric of error, and hewed the granite from the quarry, and brought it for the building, he, coming in the close of their labours, executed and perfected all that they had prepared or done, as much as any one man can be said to have done it. To the theological inquirer he is a master-builder of the system of our doctrine. His formal and deliberate judgment, therefore, is of the greatest value” (pp. 300, 301).

Presently he adds, that Jewel's *Defence of his Apology* “may be reckoned perhaps the most accurately digested system of reformed doctrine, as far as it goes, the most scrupulously and deliberately worded, which our Church produced in its debate with the Church of Rome” (p. 312).

What makes this testimony of the greater value is, that Mr. Davison, in spite of his reverent and admiring temper, is not indiscriminate in his praise. He has his antipathies and dis-

likes ; and it will serve to give some further notions of his theological system, on which we have imperceptibly fallen, to state who are the objects of them. This will be pretty evident by two or three clauses or expressions from his various works. Lightfoot, he says, "is one of the last writers to deserve our confidence, either for his perspicuity as a scholar, or his justness of thinking as a divine" (p. 60); though he owns him (p. 62) as a "really learned and good man." Speaking of Bochart, he says, "Here is a person, a prodigy of learning," yet "setting the example of" a "licentious theology" (p. 144). He speaks of "the rash positions of Clopperburch, Heidegger, and Witzius" (p. 96); and certain "superficial ideas of Witzius," whom he calls a "foreign divine." He speaks of some arguments of Carpzov and Leidekker, as "*plane inepta et futilia*" (p. 111, note); is disrespectful towards Buddeus (p. 128); considers certain representations of Warburton as "most unsatisfactory or erroneous" (p. 151), and observes that that writer "had no dislike of bold ingenuity, not free from paradox" (p. 152). Although he speaks respectfully of the continental Reformers, he says, "We do not require any foreign aid, either to ascertain or uphold our own belief" (p. 317), and refuses "to accept them as arbiters or witnesses in our own doctrine" (p. 318). He speaks of "Beccaria, Voltaire, and the Empress Catherine" as "all foreigners," and adds, "perhaps there is a vulgar taste in many of our speculators at home to admire the wisdom of other countries, as we do their fashions" (p. 486).

Considering the hereditary and habitual opinions of his day, it is not wonderful that he does not look upon the Fathers as the spokesmen and witnesses of a far more pure and religious age than our own ; yet it is remarkable, still, how different his tone is concerning them from that of most of his contemporaries. Speaking of an opinion on the origin of sacrifice in "modern theology," which contradicted theirs, he says :—

"This, at the best, is a cheerless and unsatisfactory state of the controversy. For although the fathers of the Church are neither to be reckoned infallible, nor free from serious error, yet it is a mortification

to our charity, in our communion with them, to find that any important opinion which they have taught, shall be deemed to be at variance with the foundations of our faith. One would wish to think there might be piety and safety in their error; although, if we have been blessed in later times with some superior light, there can be no reason for us to retain their mistakes, but only to spare their honour and memory. But when the primitive Fathers took their impression from the Scripture history, concerning the first appointment of sacrifice, I believe that they derived it by reading, in this instance, with a candour and ingenuousness of mind which we would do well to imitate" (p. 128).

The writer of the Preface informs us that, after he had completed his *Origin of Sacrifice*, he entertained an intention of editing a selection from the writings of the early Church, with a view, as he expressed it, of "introducing the study of the Fathers a little, and blending old and new divinity together" (p. x.). He also observes, with reference to the additional notes which he now publishes of Mr. Davison's upon that work, that "many of them are references to the Fathers, to the study of whose works he found himself drawn more and more in the later years of his theological reading" (p. xiii.).

It has been implied above that Mr. Davison is rather a teacher of *principles* than of *doctrines*. This might be illustrated at some length from the separate publications of which the volume before us is composed; the "Essay on Baptismal Regeneration" is of course doctrinal, but with this exception, nearly every one, as it comes, has its own philosophical principle or view which it undertakes to maintain. Thus, in the "Essay on Sacrifice," we are taught with great force of reasoning the acceptableness of "will worship," or spontaneous piety, the real obligation and character of natural religion, and the mistake of "asking a revelation for every duty of religion," which, he adds, "has been actively employed in the Christian Church, to its misfortune and disturbance, ever since the Reformation," and "has been the master-engine of the Puritan system" (p. 95). In this Assize Sermon he considers "this principle laid down by the Apostle, that lawful power for the administration of justice is not less than the minister of God" (p. 183). In his Sermon before the

Corporation of the Trinity House, he lays down the maxim, "the union of religion with all our graver concerns is in a manner the main, I had almost said the only, work of our lives here." "And," he proceeds, "to point out the consistency of the one with the other, and the strict relation they bear to each other, may be useful to their joint interests. It is a vain faith and piety which does not penetrate the concerns of life" (p. 210). In his National School Sermon (which embraces most important subjects, and in which he was the first distinctly and boldly to lay down positions, at the time almost paradoxes, but now happily taken for granted among religious people), he says that "education will never produce virtue by precepts repeated and truths inculcated," that "the power of reading, or the use of it, makes no man either wise or virtuous," and that "no mechanism as yet has invented the wheel to make a nation brave, united, or happy.' In his review of Mr. Edgeworth's work, he insists that "the professional character is not the only one which a person engaged in a profession has to support" (p. 424), and "that certain studies improve the judgment, and others do not" (p. 434). In his remarks on our criminal law, he discusses the true principles of punishment, capital punishment, the expedience of discretionary power, and the like. And his "Dialogue between a Christian and a Reformer" lays down the duty of religious fear as of the essence of all true religion.

Doctrines are the limits or issues of principles, and if the principles be religious, they do legitimately and naturally lead to revealed doctrines, where such revelation is made. It was Mr. Davison's unhappiness to live at a time when Christian doctrine was under a partial eclipse, and hence his principles are far more Catholic, or, we will rather say, positive and defined, than his dogmatic statements. His principles and their definiteness are his own; his doctrines, or rather their indistinctness, is the peculiarity of his age. Thus, to take one case in point, in his Assize Sermon some excellent remarks occur on the necessity of the principles of morals and religion being externally recommended to the individual, as a sort of memento and protection to him, by public positive institutions, and he says, and

truly, that the law of the land fulfils this office ; but still it is observable he keeps a profound silence about that Institution, directly divine, which has been indefinitely more highly honoured and favoured than any national law, and which is the true realisation of the principle under review.

“If,” he justly argues, “we make the whole of this world in its affairs a contrivance of man, and see nothing in it beyond its combinations, etc. . . . But . . . more rational is it to regard Him as working unseen by things visible, the instruments of His providence. The moral discipline of the social law claims at least to be derived from Him. The apostle has so represented it. Its fitness, its necessity to the state of man, is the internal evidence that he has represented it truly. . . . Those who may think themselves individually so far raised by the advantageous care of education, or the inestimable privilege of religion, as to be independent of the restraints of human jurisdiction for their integrity of principle, should be reminded of two things, which may not always reach them, in the elevation of their moral security. First, that the *most universal*, the *most certain instruction* which falls to the lot of their humble fellow-creatures, when they come to years of moral competence, is that which results from the known institutions of the law of the country in which they live. *This is their education and theory.* It is the *obvious practical address* to their understanding and conscience. *It meets them at their entrance into life, and prepares them with some stock of ideas for duty.* It is their *first and plainest* rule of action. That it should be their only one, no Christian could ever desire. Neither should he desire that it should be weakened or taken away from them. Let none, therefore, disparage an order of things imparting to others a benefit which he himself perhaps may not stand in need of. But, secondly, who will presume to say how far the highest principles of duty in his own mind are independent of that *amelioration of society* which is the acknowledged result of a wise and equitable system of judicature, laying crime under the interdict and infamy of a public condemnation ; propagating through all orders a *deference to some known rule* ; inducing peace, civilisation, security of private life, culture of faculties and feelings, and even *preparing the way* for a more general and enlightened knowledge of *religion* ?” (p. 191).

That the law does all that this admirable passage attributes to it we shall be the last to deny : but what a most serious witness

is it against an age, when so deep and reverential a mind, giving utterance to its meditations in the heart of the most religious university in the world, does not recognise the Church Catholic as an authoritative instrument of teaching, warning, impressing, fortifying the minds of a Christian people, but speaks of the human law as "the most certain instruction," as their earliest guardian, as furnishing them at least "with *some* stock of ideas for duty," as "their plainest rule of action;" nay, as if the Mother of Saints were dead or banished, a thing of past times or other countries, actually applies to the law of the land language which *she* has introduced, figures of which *she* exemplified the reality, and speaks of the law as "laying crime *under the interdict* and infamy of a public condemnation." Men cannot at their will change the state of things: it would have been unreal in Mr. Davison to have spoken otherwise. Had he said that the law was *not* the most authoritative teacher in the country, but that the Church had the higher authority and the more urgent influence, he would have said the thing that was not. Had he enlarged on the prerogatives of the Church, he would have been set down as a theorist or a papist for his pains. He was quite bold enough in publishing his *Remarks on Education*; and we know an instance of a young clergyman, not very long afterwards, one of the many who are indebted to his writings, preaching a sermon for some schools near London, in which he innocently ventured to repeat some of the sentiments of Mr. Davison's own discourse, and encountering thereupon the extreme surprise and disgust of his principal hearers, who hardly would speak to him when they met in vestry to count the collection, and who pronounced his composition to be "truly a charity sermon, for it required great charity to sit it out." This was at that day the award of opinions which now are taken as first principles within the Church, which circulate as free as air, and which the stars of the season go about spouting, with great satisfaction, at all meetings, and in any episcopal chapel, secure of the risk of any *ism* whatever being affixed to their names in consequence. But if such was the strangeness of opposing Campbell the poet and my Lord Brougham in the

year 1827, how great would have been the extravagance, the wildness, the inanity, in 1817, of speaking, in the pulpit of St. Mary's, of the Rule and the Majesty and the Jurisdiction and the Sanctions of Holy Church? We know the fate of St. Paul at Areopagus, and without forgetting the venerated names of Van Mildert and others, then in authority, we suspect they would have been as quite alive as others, though more indulgent, to so unseasonable and abrupt an exhibition of the pearls of the Gospel.

There is another quality akin to reverence in Mr. Davison which makes it unsafe to accept his words in their very letter, and that is his extreme courteousness and consideration towards those for or to whom he is writing. He adopts somewhat of the tone of St. Paul on the occasion just referred to, or before Festus and Agrippa, and takes their part or their side as much as ever he can, sometimes, perhaps, a little too much. It should be recollected, for instance, that the above panegyric on the law of the land was preached before the Judges; one is only tempted to regret that he had not sometimes the Church to preach before as well. The same tendency is conspicuous in his praise of Warburton, in the passage from his *Warburtonian Lectures* above quoted, a very different view of that bold writer being given us in his *Origin of Sacrifice*. On such occasions we could even suspect our revered author of indulging in a little amiable rhetoric. Surely it is not unnatural to suppose that the extreme *goût* with which he sets about the production of Jewel's evidence, arises from the circumstance of its telling so completely on the side of the high Church. And we must plainly state our feeling that the following passage in his "Review of the Oxford and Edinburgh Controversy" is written under the generous bias which the defence of a friend would create. The eminent person who had defended the University against the Northern Review, had been accused of writing with "heat and asperity." Mr. Davison observes :—

"It is a bad symptom when a party is too patient under bold calumny before the world. Far from censuring some warmth of language in

repelling an accusation, we should hardly believe a person had virtue enough to feel the infamy of the charge, or was in earnest about his character, who should preserve exactly the same courtesy and coolness in replying to his accuser, which we shall require of him in discussing a point of abstract criticism, and setting up one opinion against another. It is something wholly different from the credit of an opinion that is at stake. The courtesy of amicable hostilities is at an end when personal reputation is deeply wounded; and we must think of another criterion whereby to judge of the propriety of controversial language in such a case as this. Coarseness, illiberality, and vulgar insult are in every case to be condemned; but these are offences for which our censure must fall, not upon the champion of the learned body, but upon his assailants" (pp. 404, 405).

One other instance shall be given of this peculiarity of Mr. Davison's manner; and, since it is very tame to carry a critique to an end without some spice of criticism, we shall take the opportunity of raising a small quarrel with him upon it, even were it only to show that we are *not* courteous, and then we shall take our leave of his volume.

Mr. Davison, then, in his sermon at Deptford, is led to praise Societies for public objects generally, and that of the Trinity House in particular. We cannot of course quarrel with such a judgment, because, as any one will admit, there is, to say the least, a great deal of truth in it. And we have a pleasure in availing ourselves of his expressive language :—

"The great number of institutions confessedly of a religious, benevolent, or useful design in this country, may pass for one of its distinguishing excellences. They are the offspring of the improved mind of the country, fostered in the shade of civil security, and as they serve to invite to the profit of some serious purpose the social dispositions which might otherwise run to waste in a frivolous indulgence, with no rational designation upon it, nor leaving any benefit behind it, they contribute their share to the increase of the whole stock of public virtue, as well as of public service. For we should greatly err if we did not look at institutions and establishments, not merely as depositories of public utility, but also as nourishers of the virtue and personal qualifications that are to produce it. Private beneficence, indeed, has its duty always at hand,

but there are interests and services of value to the community which no single or separate efforts could either adequately arrange or accomplish. When, therefore, by the hallowed patriotism of such foundations, a well-ordered system of any public utility has been set on foot, it enlists into its service the zeal of those who have the power and the will to think for their neighbourhood or their country, and turns their endeavours into a safe and judicious course, instead of leaving them to be lost in the desultory, uncombined, and ill-applied attempts of their own private suggestion. Such institutions give a fixed point and a tone, as well as a system, to the purpose which they adopt. They offer a place, therefore, where all who can may cast in their share towards it to the greatest advantage. Nor is it unworthy of being mentioned, that they lend a fair opening to mutual esteem and good will; as men meet in them not like competitors for an interest, nor to divide the labour of a compulsory duty, but with the liberal heart of men pledged to each other in a free service, and learn to love their brethren and companions for their common work's sake. . . .

“In that course of change, however, to which all human works are liable, it will happen sometimes that institutions of ancient utility lose this application to present use, or decline from that industry and vigour with which they need to be supported; and remain then as monuments of a departed benefit, sacred even in its ashes. The substantial credit and efficacy of your institution, however, remain to this day unimpaired; and if I did not fear to offend by the indelicacy of praise, I ought, in following the general voice, to say more, and state that the administration of it is as highly maintained, as it is certain that its ends and purposes, instead of being passed away, are rather daily rising in their importance” (pp. 212-214).

These last sentences explain the meaning and drift of that eulogy upon Societies in general of which the whole extract forms but a part; not that we have any complaint against it in the abstract (on the contrary we entirely concur in the sentiments it expresses), whatever may be our opinion of certain existing associations, religious and irreligious, whether viewed in their constitution or in their practical working. But what we do think ungracious and hard is, that by way of heightening his eulogy, the author *contrasts* the societies of this day with a certain institution of times past, as if the latter just did *not* contemplate, and

did *not* do, what present societies both contemplate and do; whereas it both contemplated and did what existing societies even if they all contemplate, certainly often fail to do, and fully exemplified all those benefits which Mr. Davison justly attributes to the principle of combination itself—we mean the Monastic Rule. Let our complaint be clearly apprehended: Mr. Davison does not merely contrast monastic with Protestant and other societies of this day, as if they both had the same general end, but the former failed in what the latter succeeded in effecting; but, what seems to us paradoxical, he denies that the monastic principle *is* gregarious, co-operative, industrious, practical, and productive. This seems to be contrary to well-known historical fact. His words are these :—

“ [The Gospel] is full and positive in requisitions applying to the distributive welfare of society; insomuch that it may be reckoned *one of the most evident perversions* of religious doctrine which in an age of darkness exalted the *secluded exercise of a monastic virtue* as the perfection of a Christian spirit. Read but the discourses of our Saviour, or His parables, or read a page of His apostles, and you will see they all imply that the persons to whom they are addressed are engaged in the active and mixed duties; and were they not so engaged, that those discourses and writings might in great measure have been spared. The matter contained in them would have nothing to attach upon; it would be addressed to beings not in the state which the instruction supposes, and would be instructing them in sentiments and offices which their actual occupation did not need ” (pp. 206, 207).

Now it is difficult to do justice to the various thoughts to which this representation gives rise. First of all, is it not a violence to history to speak of “monastic virtue” as “secluded,” in the sense here intended, viz., as not “engaged in the active and mixed duties”? Would our author say that a *family* was secluded from social relations and occupations? would he speak of “the secluded exercise of a *domestic* virtue”? for what is a monastery but a family? and in what sense is it secluded in which the greater part of the world is not secluded already? How was a nun more secluded from active duties in her cloister,

who had her duties found for her, than most single women of small means and few acquaintances, who have no duties at all, are secluded now? The difference is, that the one may walk about as she will, may speak to whom she will, may dress as she will, may read what she will, may visit about if she will, and may do nothing if she will; and does the exercise of "the active and mixed duties" so depend upon these opportunities that not to have these opportunities is to be cut off from that exercise altogether? Would our author go the length of saying that it is a duty for every young woman to marry, lest she should incur the "perversion" of a dark age?

Supposing a monastic life were nothing else than seclusion in the cloister, would it in consequence have no trials and duties? Is there not trial, duty, self-denial of many kinds in a family? Is it not as difficult as it is "good and joyful, for brethren to dwell together in unity"? Is there not much exercise of temper, much call on a placable, unselfish, patient, forbearing, cheerful disposition, much occasion for self-control in word and in deed, in family life? How is it then to the purpose, true though it be, as Mr. Davison says, that "meekness, forgiveness of injuries, humility, preference of each other in honour, would have no room to be practised, if every man, as he is a Christian, were to be shut up in solitude in a sphere of his own"? It is true that "the meek and chastened spirit, which is the sum of these duties, could neither be tried nor acquired, were the collision and intercourse of other men's feelings and interests so studiously avoided, as that we should have nothing to conceal, nothing to forgive, nothing to forbear" (p. 207); but what a pretty sort of a monk is he who has a will of his own, and is *not* meek, *not* self-abasing, *not* forgiving? *Obedience* is one of the three special characteristics of the monastic life, as its professed instance in our Great Exemplar is that of His "going down to Nazareth and being *subject* to His parents." Had He no opportunity of meekness and humility till He was thirty and began to preach?

We have said this as contemplating a monastic life in its essence, and when viewed at the least advantage. But commonly it has been united or rather devoted to employments directly

productive of the graces specified; or, again, of a directly beneficial and useful nature. Mr. Davison says that—

“The whole of the active part of a Christian charity manifestly derives its very being from a participation in the concerns of our fellow-creatures. Bountifulness, beneficence, personal kindness, personal service, are only so many other modes of expression for a manner of living with others and living for them. They are wholly relative in their feeling and their practice; and the same divine authority which enjoins them, places us in that busy and peopled world which gives them their proximate motive and their opportunity of action. In short, the very love of our neighbour, which is the second great commandment, must fall to the ground, unless we keep a station of intercourse with him, and make him the better for our existence; and even the first commandment, the love of God, is made to have its evidence and its perfect work in the fulfilment of the second” (p. 207).

Most accurate and important sentiments surely; but in order to show how a monastic life is not destructive, but rather is the great fulfilment of both the first and the second commandment of the law, we are tempted to refer to the life of a Spanish saint, whom another Church commemorates on the very day on which we happen to be writing, and who was on the one hand the founder of the order of *Charity*, on the other, for his work's sake, received the name of “*John of God*.” He began, says Alban Butler, by hiring

“a house to harbour poor sick folks in, whom he served and provided for with an ardour, prudence, economy, and vigilance that surprised the whole city. This was the foundation of the Order of Charity in 1540, which, by the benediction of Heaven, has since been spread all over Christendom. John was occupied all day in serving his patients; in the night he went out to carry in new objects of charity, rather than to seek out provisions for them, for people of their own accord brought him in all necessities for his little hospital. Indeed, the charity, patience, and modesty of St. John, and his wonderful care and foresight, engaged every one to admire and favour the institute. But his charity was not confined to his own hospital; he looked upon it as his own misfortune if the necessities of any distressed person in the whole country had remained unrelieved. He therefore made strict inquiry

into the wants of the poor over the whole province, relieved many in their own houses, employed in a proper manner those who were able to work, and with wonderful sagacity laid himself out every way to comfort and assist the afflicted members of Christ. He was particularly active and vigilant in settling and providing for young maidens in distress, to prevent the danger to which they are often exposed of taking bad courses. He also reclaimed many who were already engaged in vice; for which purpose he sought out public sinners, and holding a crucifix in his hand, with many tears exhorted them to repentance. Though his life seemed to be taken up in continual action, he accompanied it with perpetual prayers and incredible corporal austerities. And his tears of devotion, his frequent raptures, and his eminent spirit of contemplation gave a lustre to his other virtues."

Perhaps it may be thought unfair to take the Order of Charity as a specimen of the ordinary course of monastic discipline, an Order which commands the respect even of enlightened Protestants; yet it will be found that the service of hospitals is but one out of various religious objects and active labours with which that discipline has ever been connected. Schools, for instance, whether for high or low, are another of these occupations; orphan-houses are another; literary or theological pursuits another. Again, from the first the monastic bodies have been an instrument in the hands of Providence for the maintenance of orthodoxy: the Sons of St. Antony were the champions and the refuge of St. Athanasius. All the great Fathers and Bishops of the Church were monks; yet who was more busy in the crowd of men than Chrysostom? who has been so influential in theology as Augustine? to whom is our personal faith more indebted than to Athanasius? who had greater sway in king's courts than Ambrose? who is more fruitful in practical lessons than Pope Gregory? Even in those times, when monastic bodies seemed to do least, and when the sloth and corruption of some brought disgrace upon all, they were, as we all know, the preservers of ancient literature; and let any one reflect what the state of our historical and doctrinal knowledge would be now, were it not for

those whom we are tempted to accuse as “*fruges consumere nati*.” And as regards the other sex, so far from making women idle and profitless, it is the only institution which hitherto has been able to give dignity, and, as it were, rank to female celibacy, and to secure an honourable and useful application of it. How great a number of women in this Protestant land spend their lives in doing nothing! how much labour, to use secular language, is lost to the community! what numbers are led to throw themselves and their happiness away on husbands unworthy of them, because, when they would fain not be useless in their day, marriage is the only path open to their ambition!

Mr. Davison speaks forcibly and well of the divine wisdom of the Gospel in “reducing the matter of duty to some *plain specific exercise*, some *direct and substantial* instance of application” (p. 209); now is not this one special object of the monastic rule, to give a definite penance to those who would repent, definite duties to those who would grow in love, definite safeguards to those who are under temptation, definite objects to those who have high but vague aspirations? Again, he says that “when that object is really a good and praiseworthy one,” societies for the furtherance of objects of public utility “are like *main works and fortresses* in the map of life against the evils and deficiencies which lie around it” (p. 211); but why are the learned Benedictines, or the Order of Trinity for the redemption of captives, to be exempted from this eulogy? We can perfectly understand its being said, that the monastic rule may be perverted, and may become mischievous; we can comprehend the state of mind under which it might be pronounced to do more harm than good, or might be condemned as pure evil; but we do not know what the language means when it is spoken of *historically* as destructive of our influence upon our fellow-creatures. If retirement and secrecy are incompatible with usefulness, what becomes of those remarks on Mr. Davison’s own history with which we commenced? When we attempt to analyse the popular prejudice on the subject, it seems to result in a proposition of this kind:—that the only channel of doing

good to others is, first, married life, secondly, going into society, for monachism forbids at most nothing beyond; and, to repeat our own words, how many among ourselves are so far constrained monks, without its principle of association or its high religious idea in compensation! Again, it is in societies for public objects, says our author, "that the better feelings of our kind, being trained and brought forward, look abroad for *connection and co-operation*; that men *attract one another to a common cause*; and their union becomes *safe and useful* under the auspices of *responsible personal character*, and with the sanction of an *acknowledged public confidence*" (p. 211). And in a passage already quoted, "Such institutions give a *fixed point* and a *tone*, as well as a system, to the purpose which they adopt." But it would be as tedious as it is, we think, a needless work, to show in all its details that the wise and philosophical remarks he has made upon the principle of combination for public objects do in a special and singular way find their fulfilment and exemplification in that holy and ancient discipline which he opens them by disparaging.

But there is one sentiment of his which surprises us more than any other—viz., that monachism is inconsistent with our Lord's precepts, which literally have no subjects, no drift, if it is to be allowed. Now let us take the monastic rule, even as practised by those who were *not* monks, but hermits, anchorites, fathers of the desert, and the like. Supposing, then, for argument's sake, that they are violating plain commands of the Gospel, about which a word shall be added presently, yet are there no commands, as, for instance, concerning poverty and humility, which, taken in their first and obvious meaning, a life other than monastic plainly violates? We are not at all saying or dreaming, of course not, that persons who do not take our Lord's precepts in the letter are actually violating them, yet we think that if they do not take care to keep them at least in the spirit instead, they certainly are. And while it is pretty clear that society, as at present constituted, does not keep the commands in question either in letter or spirit, it seems to us clear also, that whether a literal observance be necessary or not, monastic

institutions do, of all others, most accurately and comprehensively fulfil the *code* of Gospel commandments, whether those which the present age does not fulfil, or those which it does. Indeed, there cannot be a doubt *who* the instances are, and *where* we must look for them, of obedience to the precept of "not resisting evil;" of "turning the cheek to the smiter;" of "selling that we have and giving alms;" "of selling all that we have," in order to be perfect; of having our "loins girded about and lights burning;" of "watching and praying always;" of "taking no thought for the morrow;" of "taking up the cross daily;" and of a number of other particulars which might be mentioned. And if, as we have already been urging, monastic bodies are on the other hand far from neglecting those *social* duties which Mr. Davison truly says have so essential a portion and so exalted a place in Christian obedience, then it will follow that they fulfil *more* than any other set of men, and instead of being "one of the most violent perversions of religious doctrine," they are the nearest approach to the perfection of a Christian spirit.

Nor is even the eremitical rule itself, nor surely, much less, are associations for the main purpose of prayer and intercession, incapable of justification or excuse. Mr. Davison excepts all associations which are for the good of the community; and considering that Christianity has made the offering of praise and prayer its especial "Liturgy," or public service, it is surely a want of faith to deny that they above all men may be benefactors to their brethren who spend their lives in devotional exercises. Moreover, it should be recollected that there is no one, to speak in general terms, but is the better for occasional retreats from the world; and the more active and useful is his life, the greater is his need of them. But the occasional retirement of the many requires the livelong retirement of the few, and an establishment of recluses is but the sanctuary of the uncloistered. To be shut out from the world is their very duty to the world; to be in leisure is their business; and as well might we call a schoolmaster inactive, or a private circle anti-social, as an institution which devotes itself to repentance,

intercession, and giving of thanks for the benefit of the secular, as a propitiation in the sight of Heaven, and a witness and warning before men, as the home of the helpless, and the refuge of the downcast, as a common mould of character, and a bond of mutual love, and a principle of united worship to all, because it is successively the school and confessional of each.

And, lastly, if objectors urge the well-known history of St. Simeon Stylites as an instance of that "secluded exercise of a monastic virtue in an age of darkness," to which Mr. Davison must be referring, we remind such persons that Theodoret, an author for whom he had a special respect, informs us, on his own knowledge, that this mystical religionist converted, by means of his pillar, "many myriads" of pagans, which is good work for any man's lifetime, and more than they are likely to do by their rational religion one and all together.

On the whole, then, we look upon the sentiment of Mr. Davison, on which we have been thus freely commenting, as only another instance, in addition to those which we have mentioned, in which a great mind was unconsciously swayed by deference to the opinions among which he lived, and which, for what we know, could not have been prevented, in his particular case, without some portion of irreverence, love of paradox, or self-confidence, most foreign to his character. There are ten thousand questions, whether of fact or of opinion, on which every one of us must be content to remain without any view of his own, and must take the current notions of his day, unless he will incur the certainty of being unreal and the risk of being untrue. Mr. Davison probably as little thought of analysing the sentiments to which we have called attention in these last pages, as of seeking "death in the pot" at his meals, or suspecting arsenic in his candles. It is the trial and mystery of our position in this age and country, that a religious mind is continually set at variance with itself, that its deference to what is without contradicts suggestions from within, and that it cannot obey what is over it without rebelling against what was before it.

JOHN KEBLE.¹

IT is far from our intention to approach the work of so deservedly celebrated a writer as the author of the *Christian Year* in a controversial, or even in a critical spirit. That the poems which we have named below are really his we make no question, though we are not told so in the title-page. There are few of them which do not bear clear marks of their relationship to those which are so familiar to our memories and our hearts; and that (unlike the *Lyra Apostolica*) they have all one and the same parentage is evident, on the principle that *exceptio probat regulam*, from the circumstance that one of them, and one only, is ascribed, in a note appended to it, to another person. One or two there are which are somewhat different from the rest in style, and there are metres introduced which do not occur in the *Christian Year*; the matter too is not so condensed, nor the thoughts so recondite; but such varieties are found in the separate works of every author—time, place, age, frame of mind, subject, giving to each its distinctive character. The *Christian Year* was published in 1827; the *Lyra Apostolica* (as far as it is Mr. Keble's) is the *Christian Year* of 1833; the *Lyra Innocentium* is the *Christian Year* of 1846. The circumstances of 1827 and 1846 differ from each other more than the two volumes which belong to those respective dates.

We have not the analytical powers which would warrant a critical survey of so gifted an intellect as has given birth to these poems; and we have not quite the heartless officiousness

¹ From the *Dublin Review*, June 1846. Suggested by *Lyra Innocentium*; *Thoughts in Verse on Christian Children, their Ways and their Privileges*.

to view them in a controversial aspect. If they have a special characteristic, it is that they are not controversial, in this aspect differing from other poems of the same school. Whether we look at the *Lyra Apostolica*, or the *Cathedral and Baptistery*, loyalty to the Anglican Church is here or there secured or attempted by attacks on the See of Rome and the Catholic Church; some few traces of this peculiarity are found even in the *Christian Year*. But the volume before us preserves an emphatic silence on the subject of other Churches. It will teach the happy children who are submitted to its influence, at least by implication, that there is no contrariety, no separation between the different portions of Christendom; that Christianity is everywhere the same, the religion of peace and truth, with one and the same great daily rite, one and the same profession of faith. Catholics, at least, are not called to find fault with such a representation.

Nor do we find in this volume any strong language against those who have recently left the Anglican Church, as is the manner with the periodicals and pamphlets which express the sentiments of the party with which the author's name is connected. That he seriously disapproves of their step is evident even from the fact that he does not take it himself, for such a step is either a duty or a sin; nay, he distinctly records his feeling on the subject: at the same time he records it without bitterness, violence, or injustice towards the persons concerned. In his introductory stanzas "to all friendly readers," he desires their prayers

"That he

A true and timely word may frame
For weary hearts, that ask to see
Their way in our dim twilight-hour:
His lips so purged with penance-fire,
That he may guide them, in Christ's power,
Along the path of their desire;

"And with no faint and erring voice
May to the wanderer whisper, 'Stay:
God chooses for thee: seal His choice,
Nor from thy Mother's shadow stray.'"

It will be observed that he here recognises himself distinctly as "guiding" others, and that "with no faint nor erring voice." And in another place he seems to compare those who "mistrust their elders" and leave the Anglican Church to St. Thomas, who would himself see, before he believed the Resurrection—a kind comparison, because St. Thomas was an Apostle notwithstanding, but still of very decided meaning. The poem is on the general subject of wilfulness and "worldly wisdom," in refusing to "see with others' eyes;" it ends thus:—

"Alas! that man his breath should lose
In wayward, doubting race,
Nor his still home in shelter choose
Where Thou hast set his place" (p. 109).

Would that others had confined themselves to this—we will not say kind and gentle, but—*equitable* tone in their reproofs; we speak not of one person or another, but of the generality of those who have felt it a duty to animadvert on recent converts to the Catholic Church. We are not here crying for mercy, but asking justice, demanding common English fairness; we have a right to expect, but we do not find, that considerate, compassionate, comprehensive judgment upon their conduct, which, instead of fixing on particular isolated points in it, views it as a whole—uses the good, which is its general character, to hide its incidental faults—makes one part explain another, what is strong here excuse what is weak there, and evident sincerity of intention atone for infirmity of performance; which has a regard to circumstances, to the trial of an almost necessary excitement, the necessity of acting beyond exception, yet of acting without precedent, and of reaching a certain object when each assignable path has its difficulties. We are not apologising for their great and momentous decision, but for the peculiarities which have accompanied its execution; if to do as much as this be considered after all asking for mercy not for equity, it is only such mercy, to say the least, as they, as well as the subjects of their censure, will require on a day to come. In the well-known words of the poet—

“In the course of justice, none of us
Should see salvation; we do pray for mercy;
And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
The deeds of mercy.”

And we on our parts will show to these objectors so much consideration, as to allow that they do not pass their censures wantonly. We do not hold them justified in those censures, but we are able to enter into the feelings under which they pass them. Such censures are necessary for their position. When men of education, of good abilities, of blameless lives, make great sacrifices, give up their place in society, their friends, and their means of living, in order to join another communion, it is a strong argument, as far as any single argument is strong, for that communion's claim on the dutiful regard of Christians generally. And, in the instances before us, the argument came with particular cogency to those persons, and they were not few, who were united to the converts by ties of friendship, kindred, or gratitude. It was impossible that such persons should not be moved by the example thus held out to them; and, this being the case, there was no saying how far its influence might spread. In consequence it became very necessary to show, with respect to the seceding parties, that there was something faulty in the mode in which they had severally detached themselves from their original communion—a fault such as to invalidate the testimony of each, and to destroy its logical and rhetorical force. It was a great point to be in a condition to say, that not any one of them but might have acted better than he did; and, whereas by seceding they had shown no piety towards the Church of England, its doctors, or its living divines and prelates, there was no special call for delicacy in dealing with them, and no reason against imputing motives or using personalities. If motives could not be plausibly conjectured, faulty tendencies at least were discoverable in their several characters; or hypothetical failings were assignable, as restlessness or flightiness, such as would, if existing, account for their conduct by what Gibbon calls “human causes”; or, if

everything else failed, words might be cast at them, and they might be accused of "rationalism." Nay, since no man living is perfect, and such critical junctures bring out an individual mind, such as it is, into full play, develop its qualities and faculties, and magnify for the time, as in a lens, even its minutest peculiarities, and represent its faintest shades and colours, we may readily grant that never was there a case of conversion, except under the influence of extraordinary inspiration, which might not have proceeded more holily, more wisely, more religiously than it did—never a case which did not present an opportunity of criticism to those who had the heart, or felt it a necessity, or thought it a duty to criticise.

Such is the condition of all of us in this world. "Posuisti iniquitates nostras in conspectu tuo, sæculum nostrum in illuminatione vultus tui." Good friends, you have not far to seek; habetis confitentem reum; he pleads guilty; he has given up a fellowship or a living, or he has forfeited an inheritance, or ruined the prospects or present provision of wife and children, or damaged his reputation for judgment or discernment; he has cheerfully made himself a scoff, submitted himself as a prey to the newspapers, has made himself strange to his brethren; and besides and amid all this, it is true, he has said a strong word—or uttered a sarcasm—his successive disclosures have not severely kept time with the growth of his misgivings,—he has spoken to those with whom he should have been reserved, and has been silent where he should have spoken; at times he has not known where he stood, and perhaps promised what he could not perform. Of his sacrifices he thinks and says nothing; what he does know and does think of is in substance what you so rhetorically urge against him, yes, and before you urge it. His self-scrutiny has preceded your dissection of him. What you proclaim to the world, he confesses without grudging, viz., that he has but acted *secundum captum suum*, according to what he is, not as an angel, but as a man; in the process of his conversion he has had to struggle with uncertainty of mind, with the duties of an actual position, with misgivings of its untenableness, with the perplexity of fulfilling many duties and

of reconciling conflicting ones. He is not perfect; no one is perfect—not they who accuse him; he could retaliate upon them; he could gratuitously suggest reasons for their retaining their stations as they can for his relinquishing them; but it would be unworthy of him to do so. He leaves them to that judgment to which he himself appeals. May they who have spoken or written harshly of recent converts to the Catholic Church, receive at the Great Day more lenient measure than they have in this case given!

Returning to the volume which has led to these remarks, we find the author's silence concerning the affairs of the day still more emphatic than we have as yet described it. Not only is he entirely uncontroversial, as beseemed one who writes of "Christian Children, their ways and their privileges," but he abstains almost entirely from any allusion whatever to the existing state and prospects of the English Church. In this respect he is singularly in contrast with himself in the *Christian Year*, which, though written for the personal edification of private persons, abounds in sentiments about ecclesiastical matters as existing at the date of its composition. These sentiments wear the character of forebodings, and those forebodings seem, from the event or the present position of affairs, to be almost prophetic. He wrote and published in a time of peace and plenty for his Church, when Lord Liverpool's government was in power, when Church patronage was dispensed more respectably than perhaps it ever had been, and when Church reform had not even showed itself on paper. In those palmy days of the Establishment our author discerned that neither in doctrine nor in ethical standard was she even as much as she might have been according to her principles, and as she had been from time to time in the persons of certain of her children. He considered he perceived, not merely corruption of life, but failure of faith, and judgment in the horizon. He described the world, which once attended our Lord in triumph into Jerusalem, as now

"Thronging round to gaze

On the dread vision of the latter days,

Constrained to own Thee, but in heart
 Prepared to take Barabbas' part ;
 'Hosanna' now, to-morrow 'Crucify,'
 The changeful burden still of their rude lawless cry."

And then he asked—

"But what are heaven's alarms to hearts that cower
 In wilful slumber, deepening every hour,
 That draw their curtains closer round,
 The nearer swells the trumpet's sound?
 Lord, ere our trembling lamps sink down and die,
 Touch us with chastening hand, and make us feel Thee nigh."

He speaks of the "watchman true," as

 "Waiting to see what God will do,
 As o'er the Church the gathering twilight falls:
 No more he strains his wistful eye,
 If chance the golden hours be nigh,
 By youthful hope seen beaming round her walls.

 Forced from his shadowy paradise,
 His thoughts to heaven the steadier rise;
 There seek his answer when the world reproves;
 Contented in his darkling round,
 If only he be faithful found,
 When from the East the eternal morning moves."

He addresses the clergy in a similar strain—

"Think not of rest ; though dreams be sweet,
 Start up, and ply your heavenward feet ;
 Is not God's oath upon your head,
 Ne'er to sink back on slothful bed—
 Never again your loins untie,
 Nor let your torches waste and die,
 Till, when the shadows thickest fall,
 Ye hear your Master's midnight call?"

And elsewhere—

“Is this a time for moonlight dreams
Of love and home by mazy streams—
For fancy with her shadowy toys,
Aerial hopes, and pensive joys—
While souls are wandering far and wide,
And curses swarm on every side?
No—rather steel thy melting heart,
To act the martyr’s steadfast part;
To watch with firm, unshrinking eye,
Thy darling visions as they die,
Till all bright hopes, and hues of day,
Have faded into twilight gray. . . .

Pray only that thine aching heart,
From visions vain content to part,
Strong for love’s sake its woe to hide,
May cheerful wait the Cross beside,
Too happy if that dreadful day,
Thy life be given thee ‘for a prey.’”

At another time, speaking of the English Church more directly, after commencing with “Stately thy walls and holy are thy prayers,” he continues—

“O mother dear,
Wilt thou forgive thy son one boding sigh?
Forgive, if round thy towers he walk in fear,
And tell thy jewels o’er with jealous eye?”

And then he proceeds to apply to his Church Ezekiel’s fearful Vision in the Temple. Elsewhere he speaks of

“God’s new Israel, sunk as low,
Yet flourishing to sight as fair,
As Sion in her height of pride,
With queens for handmaids at her side,
With kings for nursing fathers, throned high,
And compassed with the world’s too tempting blazonry.”

And, to make one additional extract, speaking of Aaron's sin in the matter of the golden calf, he asks—

“For what shall heal, when holy water banes?
 Or who may guide
 O'er desert plains
 Thy loved yet sinful people wandering wide,
 If Aaron's heart unshrinking mould
 An idol form of earthly gold? . . .

Therefore on fearful dreams her [the Church's] inward
 sight
 Is fain to dwell;
 What lurid light
 Shall the last darkness of the world dispel—
 The Mediator, in His wrath,
 Descending down the lightning's path.”

He ends, addressing that Divine Mediator, with a continued allusion to Moses in the Mount—

“But at Thy touch let veiled hearts awake,
 That nearest to Thine altar lie,
 Yet least of holy things descry.
 Teacher of teachers! Priest of priests! from Thee
 The sweet strong prayer
 Must rise, to free
 First Levi, then all Israel from the snare.
 Thou art our Moses out of sight—
 Speak for us, or we perish quite.”

Such plaintive notes, *quales populea Philomela sub umbra*, have by this time altogether left the Poet's Lyre: as far as we have observed, not a sound remains of them in the present volume. What is the meaning of this? is it that singing-birds are silent when a storm is at hand, and that the evil in his Church is too awful and imminent for verse? Actual England is too sad to look upon. The Poet seems to turn away from the sight; else, in his own words, would it “bruise too sore his

tender heart;" he takes refuge in the contemplation of that blessed time of life in which alone the Church is what God intended it, what Christ made it, the time of infancy and childhood. He sounds a *Lyra Innocentium*. He hangs over the first springs of divine grace, and fills his water-pots with joy "ex fontibus Salvatoris," before heresy, schism, ambition, worldliness, and cowardice have troubled the still depths. He would fain have the morning last till evening; he almost confesses it—

"O sweet morning-dream, I pray,
 Pass not with the matin-hour:
 Charm me :—heart and tongue allay,
 Thoughts of gloom and eyes that lower.
 From the Fountain to the Shrine,
 Bear me on, thou trance divine;
 Faint not, fade not on my view,
 Till I wake and find thee true" (p. 11).

Thus he would live and die in a "trance" or "dream"; a dream, as he confesses it to be, since souls fall from their first innocence, as time goes on; a dream, as *we* should add, because children in the Anglican Church, though commencing their course as Catholics, yet when they come to years of discretion fall into a schismatical state. Yet we cordially thank him for his "dream"; we thank him for choosing a subject for his verse in which Catholics and he are one,—a subject such, that Catholics can claim and use his poems as expressing their own mind, not merely imposing a higher and fuller sense on them, but taking them in that very sense in which he speaks. Whatever differences Catholics may have with Mr. Keble, they have none in the main doctrine and fact on which his volume is written. If there be one point from which Catholics can look with satisfaction on this bewildered land, it is as regards the state of its baptized infants. Those infants are, in their estimation, as good Catholics as themselves, or better. The Catholic Church is the very Church of their baptism; they were baptised into nothing short of that Church; whoever

baptised them, baptised them into her and for her; she claims them as her property. There is but one baptism for the remission of sins, and she it is who administers it, wherever it is legitimately administered. Heretics and schismatics may be her instruments in this work, as perfectly as saints. She baptises by means of the Anglican communion, which is not their real mother but a stranger. By the Catholic Church they are suckled;—alas, at length the time comes when they are weaned; and then they pass into the hands of one or other foster parent, who soon detaches them from their true mother. But in their first years, till they come to years of discretion, and commit acts which separate them from her, they are as fully and absolutely the children of the Catholic Church as if they were baptised in the Catholic communion. They have angels to guard them, and saints to intercede for them; they are lovely and pleasant in their lives, and blessed in their deaths. Thus the death of children in this poor country is attended by a consolation unspeakable; the dreadful controversy about the two communions does not touch them; they are recognised as innocents on all hands, and they have been taken away from the evil to come. Bright precious thought, though dimmed of late years with a shade of sadness, from the negligence and ignorance with which the sacred rite of baptism has been so often administered!

Well would it be for all men, could they always live the life they lived as infants, possessed of the privileges, not the responsibilities of regeneration. Our author, as we have said, especially feels it at this present time; and, leaving the Anglican Church to go on as it will, and to deny truth as it will, he hides from himself all that is national, local, schismatical, existing,—he withdraws his pleading eye and his warning voice from a generation which scorns him,—he leaves bishops and clergy, cathedral chapters and ecclesiastical judges, town mobs and country squires, to the tender mercies of history, in order to enjoy a blameless Donatism, to live in a Church of children, to gaze on their looks and motions, to encourage them in good, and to guard them from harm and sin.

Thus, in some beautiful stanzas he compares a child sleeping in his cradle, first to the infant Moses in his ark of bulrushes, then to our Lord Himself asleep in the vessel.

“Storms may rush in, and crimes and woes
Deform the quiet bower ;
They may not mar the deep repose
Of that immortal flower.
Though only broken hearts be found
To watch his cradle by,
No blight is on his slumbers sound,
No touch of harmful eye.

So gently slumbered on the wave
The new-born seer of old,
Ordained the chosen tribes to save,
Nor dreamed how darkly rolled
The waters by his rushy brake,
Perchance even now defiled
With infants' blood for Israel's sake,
Blood of some priestly child.

What recks he of his mother's tears—
His sister's boding sigh ?
The whispering reeds are all he hears,
And Nile, soft weltering by,
Sings him to sleep ;—but he will wake,
And o'er the haughty flood
Wave his stern rod—and, lo ! a lake,
A restless sea of blood !

Soon shall a mightier flood thy call
And outstretched rod obey ;
To right and left the watery wall
From Israel shrinks away.
Such honour wins the faith that gave
Thee and thy sweetest boon
Of infant charms to the rude wave,
In the third joyous moon.

Hail, chosen Type and Image true
 Of Jesus on the sea !
 In slumber, and in glory too,
 Shadowed of old by thee.
 Save that in calmness thou didst sleep
 The summer stream beside,
 He on a wider, wilder deep
 Where boding night-winds sighed :—

Sighed when at eve He laid Him down,
 But with a sound like flame
 At midnight from the mountain's crown
 Upon his slumbers came.—
 Lo ! how they watch, till He awake,
 Around His rude low bed :
 How wishful count the waves that break
 So near His sacred head !” (pp. 32-34).

He inquires whether regenerate infants do not see their Saviour, and by their sudden transport on waking is reminded of the unborn Baptist at the Visitation—

“Oft as in sun-bright dawn
 The infant lifts his eye, joying to find
 The dusky veil of sleep undrawn,
 And to the East gives welcome kind,
 Or in the morning air
 Waves high his little arm,
 As though he read, engraven there,
 His fontal name, Christ's saving charm.

Oft as in hope untold
 The parent's eye pursues that eager look ;

Still in love's steady gaze,
 In joy's unbidden cry,
 That holy Mother's glad amaze,
 That infant's worship we descry.

“Still Mary’s Child unseen
Comes breathing, in the heart just sealed His own,
Prayers of high hope: what bliss they mean,
And where they soar, to Him is known,” etc. (p. 43).

To this intimate approach to the Saviour of all, vouchsafed to children, he is led to attribute, in another poem, the sort of understanding which exists between them and the brute creation.

“Thou makest me jealous, infant dear,
Why wilt thou waste thy precious smiles,
Thy beckonings blithe, and joyous wiles,
On bird or insect gliding near?
Why court the deaf and blind?
What is this wondrous sympathy,
That draws thee so, heart, ear, and eye,
Towards the inferior kind?

We tempt thee much to look and sing—
Thy mimic notes are rather drawn
From feathered playmates on the lawn—
The quivering moth, or bee’s soft wing,
Brushing the window pane,
Will reach thee in thy dreamy trance,
When nurse’s skill for one bright glance
Hath toiled an hour in vain.”

Then he speaks of the “baying bloodhound” and the “watch-dog stern,” the “war-horse,” nay, the “tiger’s whelp,” “wild elephant and mountain bull,” as well as “bounding lamb or lonely bird,” as being in league with children. The poem proceeds—

“Ah, you have been in Jesus’ arms,
The holy fount hath you imbued
With His all-healing kindly blood;
And somewhat of His pastoral charms,

And care for His lost sheep,
 Ye there have learned : in ordered tones
 Gently to soothe the lesser ones,
 And watch their noon-day sleep."

In another poem he traces the power of children over the wicked—

"A little child's soft sleeping face
 The murderer's knife ere now hath staid :
 The adulterer's eye, so foul and base,
 Is of a little child afraid.
 They cannot choose but fear,
 Since in that sign they feel God and good angels near."

He continues—

"Heaven in the depth and height is seen ;
 On high among the stars, and low
 In deep clear waters : all between
 Is earth, and tastes of earth : even so
 The Almighty One draws near
 To strongest seraphs there, the weakest infants here."

This leads him to an interpretation of the sculptured cherubs in churches, which will not be satisfactory to Iconoclasts—

"O well and wisely wrought of old,
 Nor without guide be sure, who first
 Did cherub forms as infants mould,
 And lift them where the full deep burst
 Of awful harmony
 Might need them most, to waft it onward to the sky ;

Where best they may, in watch and ward,
 Around the enthroned Saviour stand,
 May quell, with sad and stern regard,
 Unruly eye and wavering hand,
 May deal the blessed dole
 Of saving knowledge round from many a holy scroll."

—(Pp. 268-271).

The above extracts rather show the view Mr. Keble takes of the infants of the Church, than exemplify his earnestness in connecting their holy condition with the rite of baptism. On the latter point, however, he is very earnest; and, if we might theorise on the subject, we should fancy that he was not quite pleased with the Platonic tone, as it may be called, of much of the poetry of the day, which extols indeed the divine blessedness of infancy, but in so unguarded or ignorant a manner as to forget the source of it, as if this divinity belonged to children as they are born into the world, and not as washed from original sin, and gifted with regeneration. There is a studious accuracy of the author on this point.

But now we come to notice a second peculiarity in these poems, which immediately follows from their main topic being such as we have described it to be. If the author is to sing of regenerate infants and children, and is to view them in such lights as Scripture will furnish, to what is he necessarily referred at once, but to the thought of our Lord in the first years of His earthly existence, when He was yet a little one in the arms and at the breast of His blessed Mother? Hence the Virgin and Child is the special vision, as it may be called, which this truly evangelical poet has before him throughout his *Thoughts in Verse on Christian Children*; like "that holy painter" and evangelist, whom he himself speaks of,

"Who with pen and pencil true
Christ's own awful Mother drew" (p. 98).

He even introduces the thought of St. Mary, where there are neither children to suggest it nor Scripture to sanction it. He observes, that at the first Whitsuntide, "all estates, all tribes of earth" were collected; "Only sweet infancy seemed silent in the adoring earth." "Mothers and maidens" were there, "widows from Galilee," "Levites," and "elders sage." He continues—

"But nought we read of that sweet age
Which in His strong embrace He took,
And sealed it safe, by word and look,

From earth's foul dews, and withering airs of hell :
The Pentecostal chant no infant warblings swell" (p. 343).

And he goes out of his way, as follows, to supply the imagined deficiency :—

"Nay, but *She* worships here,
Whom still the Church in memory sees
(O thought to mothers dear !),
Before her babe on bended knees,
Or rapt, with fond adoring eye,
In her sweet nursing ministry.
How in Christ's anthem fails the children's part,
While Mary bears Him throned in her maternal heart?"

We feel a natural reluctance to exhibit the many traces which these poems exhibit of a similar devotional feeling towards the blessed Virgin ; it is like running through the volume to find out what are called "strong passages," a procedure which here would obviously be very offensive. Yet, since it falls into the direct line of thought which we are pursuing to enlarge upon this peculiarity of his religion, we shall do so for the sake of Catholics, who know nothing of him except that he is one of those who are retaining doubting minds in a schismatical communion, and who ought to know a great deal more of him.

For instance, the following is part of his Poem or Hymn for Easter Day :—

"The Angel came full early, But Christ had gone before,
The breath of life, the living soul, Had breathed itself once more
Into the sacred body, That slumbered in the tomb,
As still and lowly as erewhile In the undefiled womb.
And surely not in folds so bright The spotless winding-sheet
Inwrapt Him, nor such fragrance poured The myrrh and aloes sweet,
As when in that chaste bosom, His awful bed, He lay,
And Mary's prayer around Him rose, Like incense, night and day.

And even, as when her hour was come, He left His Mother mild,
 A royal Virgin evermore, Heavenly and undefiled,
 So left the glorious body The rock it slumbered on
 And spirit-like in silence passed, Nor touched the sealed stone."

—(P. 344).

He continues presently—

"He veiled His awful footsteps, Our all-subduing Lord,
 Until the blessed Magdalene Beheld Him and adored.
 But through the veil the spouse may see, For her heart is as His own,
 That to His Mother or by sight Or touch He made Him known.
 And even as from His manger-bed He gave her His first smile,
 So now, while seraphs wait, He talks Apart with her awhile :
 That thou of all the forms, Which to thee His image wear,
 Mightest own thy parents first, With thy prime of loving care."

—(P. 336).

In his poem on "Judas's Infancy" he has, what seems to us, a most touching and beautiful thought, though some may call it refined, that "the blessed Mary" doubtless thought with pity upon the poor mother who had nursed the traitor, "a harmless child," ere gold had bought him. Yet, sure it was, he grew up to be the man of whom the Voice of Truth has said, that it had been good if he had not been born :—

"Sure, as to blessed Mary come
 The saints' and martyrs' host,
 To own, with many a thankful strain,
 The channel of undying bliss,
 The bosom where the Lord hath lain,
 The hand that held by His :

Sure, as her form for evermore
 The glory and the joy shall wear,
 That robed her, bending to adore
 The Babe her chaste womb bare" (p. 67).

Elsewhere he says that "two homes of love's resort" are mentioned in Scripture—the upper room and the temple :—

“ Possessing
Alike *her* presence, whom the awful blessing
Lifted above all Adam’s race ” (p. 83).

We, in like manner, have two homes, our closet and our Church; and, in like manner,

“ The Mother of our Lord is there,
And saints are breathing hallowed air,
Living and dead, to waft on high our feeble prayer. ”

The feeling which is brought out into formal statement in these passages is intimated by the frequency and tenderness of expression with which the thought of the blessed Virgin is introduced throughout the volume. She is the “ Blessed Mary ” with her “ lily flower,” “ the Virgin blest,” “ that Maiden bright,” or “ Virgin bright,” a “ royal Virgin evermore,” Christ’s “ Mother mild,” or “ Mother dear,” “ the Mother-maid,” “ the Maiden Mother,” “ the Virgin Mother,” “ that Mother undefiled,” “ Christ’s awful Mother,” “ Mother of God,” “ the spotless Mother, first of creatures.” And Christ is “ the dread Son of Mary,” “ Mary’s child,” “ the awful child on Mary’s knee.” Perhaps the author’s most beautiful lines on this subject are those addressed to a child who had lost her mother, in which he applies to the child the words spoken by our Lord on the cross to St. John. He says that, though she has lost her natural mother, yet surely she now has the blessing of the Virgin’s patronage, to whom she had already, on the birth of a younger sister, shown her devotion.

“ Thy vision (whoso chides, may blame
The instinctive reachings of the altar flame)
Shows thee above, in yon ethereal air,
A holier Mother, rapt in more prevailing prayer.

’Tis *she* to whom thy heart took flight
Of old in joyous hour,
When first a precious sister-spright
Came to thy nursery bower.

And thou with earnest tone didst say,
 Mother, let Mary be her name, I pray,
 For dearly do I love to think upon
 That gracious Mother-Maid, nursing her Holy One."
 —(P. 153).

The deep and tender devotion which this language discovers is no novelty with our author. No reader of the *Christian Year* can forget his "Ave Maria! Thou whose name *All but* adoring love may claim;" and we may even say that, judging from these poems, his devotional feeling has but become more decided, and has more firmly based itself in his reason, as life has advanced. Shall we observe, there is one thing we "desiderate" in this volume—to use Mr. Froude's word on a similar occasion? We do not discover one "Ave Maria" throughout it, though he has used that invocation in the above passage of the *Christian Year*. We cannot doubt it has been upon his lips; why, then, is it excluded from his book? Perhaps he feared to give scandal, or to cause distress or excitement, in the use of a form of words not sanctioned by his Church; the case was different at the date of the *Christian Year*, when it would pass for mere poetry. Moreover, in two of the passages above quoted the author studiously speaks of Mary as "bending to adore the Babe," and before her Babe "on bended knees." No Catholic will quarrel with such an image, which is represented in some of the paintings of the great masters; but, as introduced in these places, it is surely out of place—is introduced to give satisfaction, or to furnish a safeguard, to others—is more fitted for polemics than for devotional poetry, and savours much of the evangelical school, who never mention one doctrine of religion by itself, lest they should be supposed thereby to deny every other, not of the author of the *Christian Year*.

Such a volume as this is a clear evidence that what is sometimes called "the movement" in the Anglican Church is not at an end. We do not say that it is spreading,—or that it will

obtain permanent footing in the communion in which it has originated,—or that it will or will not lead to a reaction, and eventually protestantise—or again weaken—a religious body to which, under favourable circumstances, it might have brought strength. We are not prophets ; we do but profess to draw conclusions ; and the above conclusion respecting “the movement,” which these poems have suggested, seems a very safe one. Nor can we venture on predicting the destiny of individuals who are connected with that movement ; for them the gravest anxieties will naturally be felt by sensitive friends, lest they should be resisting a call, and risking their election. Cases may be expected which will pierce to the heart those among ourselves who come across them. We only mean to say, that more has still to come of the opinions which have lately found such acceptance in the Church of England, because they are still alive within its pale. Our author has doubtless published the poems before us with the intention of calling people’s minds off external and dangerous subjects, of leading them back to the memory of the years when they were young, innocent, and happy, and thus persuading them calmly to repose under the shadow of the tree beneath which they were born. He has published them at a critical time, and much will be expected of them by his friends. Much certainly came of the *Christian Year* ; it was the most soothing, tranquillising, subduing work of the day ; if poems can be found to enliven in dejection, and to comfort in anxiety ; to cool the over-sanguine, to refresh the weary, and to awe the worldly ; to instil resignation into the impatient, and calmness into the fearful and agitated—they are these.

“Tale tuum carmen nobis, divine poeta,
 Quale sopor fessis in gramine : quale per æstum,
 Dulcis aquæ saliente sitim restinguere rivo.”

Or like the Shepherd’s pipe in the Oriental Vision, “The sound was exceedingly sweet, and wrought into a variety of tunes that were inexpressibly melodious and altogether different from anything I had ever heard. They put me in mind of

those heavenly airs that are played to the departing souls of good men upon their first arrival in paradise to wear out the impressions of the last agonies, and qualify them for the pleasures of that happy place. I drew near with that reverence which is due to a superior nature; and as my heart was entirely subdued by the captivating strains I had heard, I fell down at his feet and wept."

Such was the gift of the author of the *Christian Year*, and he used it in attaching the minds of the rising generation to the Church of his predecessors, Ken and Herbert. He did that for the Church of England which none but a poet could do; he made it poetical. It is sometimes asked whether poets are not more commonly found external to the Church than among her children; and it would not surprise us to find the question answered in the affirmative. Poetry is the refuge of those who have not the Catholic Church to fly to and repose upon; the Church herself is the most sacred and venerable of poets. Poetry, as Mr. Keble lays it down in his University Lectures on the subject, is a certain method of relieving the overburdened mind; it is a channel through which grief or agitation finds expression, and that a safe, regulated expression. Now what is the Catholic Church, viewed in her human aspect, but a discipline of the affections and passions? What are her ordinances and practices but the regulated expression of keen, or deep, or turbid feeling, and thus a *κάθαρσις*, as Aristotle would word it, of the sick soul? She is the poet of her children; full of music to soothe the sad and control the wayward,—wonderful in story for the imagination of the romantic,—rich in symbol and imagery, so that gentle and delicate feelings, which will not bear words, may in silence intimate their presence or commune with themselves. Her very being is poetry; every psalm, every litany, every collect, every versicle, the cross, the mitre, the thuribule, is a fulfilment of some dream of childhood, or aspiration of youth. Such poets as are born under her shadow, she takes into her service; she sets them to write hymns, or to compose chants, or to embellish shrines, or to determine ceremonies, or to marshal processions; nay, she can even make schoolmen

of them, as she made St. Thomas, till logic becomes poetical. Now the author of the *Christian Year* found the Anglican system all but destitute of this divine element, which is an essential property of the Catholic;—a ritual dashed upon the ground, trodden on, and broken piecemeal;—prayers, lopped, pieced, torn, shuffled about at pleasure, till the meaning of the composition perished, and offices which had been poetry were no longer even good prose;—antiphons, hymns, benedictions, invocations, shovelled away;—scripture lessons turned into chapters;—heaviness, feebleness, unwieldiness, where the Catholic rites had had the lightness and airiness of a spirit;—vestments chucked off, lights quenched, jewels stolen, the multitude of ministrants, the long procession, put down;—a dreariness which could be felt, and which seemed the token of an incipient Socinianism, forcing itself upon the eye, the ear, the nostrils of the worshipper; a smell of dust and damp, not of incense; a sound of ministers preaching Catholic prayers, and parish clerks droning out Catholic canticles; the royal arms for the crucifix; huge ugly boxes of wood, sacred to preachers, frowning on the congregation in the place of the mysterious altar; and long cathedral aisles unused, railed off, looking like tombs (as they were) of what had been and was not; and for orthodoxy, a frigid, unelastic, inconsistent, dull, helpless dogmatic, which could give no just account of itself, yet was tolerant of all teaching which contained a doctrine more or a doctrine less:—such was the religion of which this gifted author was,—not the witness and denouncer, a deep spirit of reverence hindered it,—but the renovator, as far as it has been renovated. Clearly as he saw the degeneracy of his times, he attributed nothing of it to his Church, over which he threw the poetry of his own mind and the memory of better days.

His happy magic made the Anglican Church seem, what Catholicism was and is. The established system found to its surprise that it had been all its life talking not prose, but poetry.

“Miraturque novas frondes et non sua poma.”

Beneficed clergymen used to go to rest as usual on Christmas Eve, and leave to ringers, or sometimes to carollers, the sole duties which were performed towards the sacred time; but now they suddenly found themselves, as if in the Catholic Church "wakeful shepherds;" and "still as the day came round," "in music and in light," the new-born Saviour "dawned upon their prayer." Anglican bishops not only had lost the habit of blessing, but are said sometimes to have been startled and vexed when asked to do so; but now they were told of their "gracious arm stretched out to bless;" moreover, what they had never dreamed when they were gazetted or did homage, they were "each an apostle true, a crowned and robed seer." The parish church had been shut up, except for vestry meetings and occasional services, all days of the year but Sundays and one or two other sacred days; but churchgoers were now assured that "martyrs and saints" had "dawned on their way," that the absolution in the Common Prayer Book was "the Golden Key each morn and eve;" moreover they heard, at a time too when the Real Presence was all but utterly forgotten or denied, of "the dear feast of Jesus dying, upon that altar ever lying," "while angels prostrate fall." They learned besides, that, what their teachers had spoken of, and sextons had not even treated, as a communion-table, was "the dread altar;" and they were told of "holy lamps blazing," of "perfumed embers quivering bright," of "the stoled priest," and the "floor by knees of sinners worn."

Such doctrine coming from one who had such claims on his readers from the weight of his name, the depth of his devotional and ethical tone, and the special gift of consolation, of which his poems were the evidence, wrought a great work in the Establishment. The Catholic Church speaks for itself, the Anglican needs external assistance; his poems became a sort of comment upon its formularies and ordinances, and almost elevated them into the dignity of a religious system. It kindled hearts towards his Church; it gave a something for the gentle and forlorn to cling to; and it raised up advocates for it among those who otherwise, if God and their good angel had suffered

it, might have wandered away into some sort of philosophy, and acknowledged no church at all. Such was the influence of the *Christian Year*; and doubtless his friends hail the *Lyra Innocentium*, as being likely to do a similar work in a more critical time. And it is to be expected that for a while something of a similar effect may follow its publication. That so revered, so loved a name as the author's, a name known by Oxford men for thirty years and more, that one who has lived "a hermit spirit" unlike the world all his days, who even in his youth caused the eyes of younger men to turn keenly towards him, if he was pointed out to them in public schools or college garden, who by the mere first touch of his hand has made them feel pierced through, so that they could have sunk into the earth for shame, and who, when removed from his loved University, was still an unseen silent influence moving hearts at his will,—that a "whisper" from him, "with no faint and erring voice," will for the time retain certain persons in the English Church who otherwise, to say the least, would have contemplated a return to that true Mother whose baptism they bear, the one sole ark of salvation, of this we make no question at all. But there is another point, of which we entertain just as little doubt, or rather are a great deal more confident,—that, as far as the volume has influence, that influence will, on the long run, tell in favour of the Catholic Church; and will do what the author does not, nay from his position alas, cannot, may not contemplate,—will in God's good time bring in a blessed harvest into the granaries of Christ. And being sure of this, much as the immediate effects of its publication may pain the hearts of those who are sighing and praying for the souls of others, we can bear to wait, we can afford to be patient, and awfully to watch the slow march of the divine providences towards this poor country.

Take the volume; consider its doctrine; consider, too, that it seldom dwells upon the English Church as a definite and actual body, but seems almost to view the infant's breast as *the* true visible Church, the only doctor and saint in the land; and then imagine what will be the direction and course of thought in those children who grow up under the teaching which it

imparts. It tells them, for instance, that in the very act and moment of baptism the soul is regenerated, and, ordinarily, is regenerated in no other way; that each soul has an angel for its guardian; that, whereas Christ works His miracles of mercy now as at the beginning, St. Mary is an instrument in them as in the marriage of Cana, and the Apostles; that the saints are rightly called gods; that "the Infinite" is in the "unbloody rite"; that the Eucharistic sacrifice is offered up daily all over the world, and that the sun never sets upon it; that the Church has ever spread in that shadow of St. Peter, which in the beginning wrought miracles, and that it shall never grow less; and that it is "duteous" to pray for quick as well as dead, a position with which he opens the first stanza in his volume. Now, in what sense is this a Church of England training? How can a child ever learn from it sympathy with and attachment to that communion, as he grows up? How is such teaching dutiful towards it? The Ethiopian, on reading the prophet Isaiah, inquired, "Of whom speaketh the prophet this?" and so the boy, the youth, the man, as he looks wider and further into the world, as he is gradually thrown upon his own thoughts, will surely ask with louder and louder voice where this teaching is to be found? whence it comes? which of the living English bishops or departed divines, and how many, which of Anglican formularies, what part of the Prayer Book, which of the Articles, what obsolete canon, or what ecclesiastical judge, sanctions its doctrines; and how far literal, tangible facts bear out its statements?—and next, whether there are not existing bishops elsewhere, and divines, and decrees, and usages, which do bear it out fully, and offer him what he is seeking; whether, in short, the author's comment is acknowledged by his text; or belongs to some other text, not his. There is but one Church which has firmly, precisely, consistently, continually held and acted upon these doctrines of the *Lyra Innocentium*; and if holding them to be token of the true Church, one and one only Church is true. It must be recollected, too, that these doctrines are part of a system; they lead to other doctrines; they gradually and imperceptibly draw

the mind into the reception of others, whether it will or no. At this very moment souls are being led into the Catholic Church on the most various and independent impulses, and from the most opposite directions. True it is, that such persons as have been taught from childhood certain principles, are able without prejudice to them to admit other doctrines which are their direct contradictories, and which tend inevitably to their destruction. Anglicans of forty years' standing may admit that St. Peter is the foundation of the Church, yet feel no misgivings in consequence that the Church of England is external to Catholic communion; but the *Lyra Innocentium* is not addressed to grown men, but to children, whose hearts and heads have yet to be formed, and who, if "trained up" (as they will be) "in the way they should go," are not likely in the end to "depart from it." Is it not, indeed, by this time abundantly clear, that, as children of the Evangelical school of the last age have so often become Latitudinarians, so the young generation whose pious and serious parents are now teaching them to cross themselves, to fast or abstain, to reverence celibacy, and to say Ave to St. Mary, if they grow up as serious and pious as their instructors, will end in being converts to the Catholic Church?

Well would it be, if the really honest holders of Anglo-Catholic principles could be made to see this; it would be the removal of a veil from their eyes; they would at once perceive that they ought to be plain Catholics. Some of them, indeed, may hitherto have had thoughts of leavening the whole English Church with their doctrine; they may have spoken of the Anglican Church as what it ought to be and was not, in the hope thereby of tending to make it what it ought to be; and now, though they see or suspect their own tendency to be towards Rome, they may put this suspicion aside, and remain where they are, in confidence that, if they are but patient, they shall ultimately succeed in bringing over their whole communion to their own views. But such a confidence has not been the feeling of the Author of the *Christian Year*, if we may judge from his writings. His imagination, creative as it is, has been

under the control of too sober a judgment, as we cannot but surmise, to acquiesce in the notion that the English Church is the natural seat of Catholicism; that you have but to preach the truth, and the heart of her members will recognise in that truth their own real sentiments, and claim their lost inheritance; that Erastianism in high places will ever become a mere matter of history; that ecclesiastical courts, university authorities, mobs and vestries, will ever lose their keen scent for detecting popery, and their intense satisfaction in persecuting it. He seems to resign himself and his friends, as if it were no "strange thing," to the prospect of unkind, unnatural treatment *for ever*, from her whom the word of prophecy has depicted as the mother of her children. He has some beautiful lines on a child's clinging to its mother's gown who appears the while to disregard it, with a reference to the miracle wrought upon the issue of blood: and it is impossible not to see that he is all the while drawing himself and the English Church in a parable.

"She did but touch with finger weak
The border of His sacred vest,
Nor did he turn, nor glance, nor speak,
Yet found she health and rest.

Well may the Word sink deep in me,
For I full many a fearful hour,
Fast clinging, Mother dear, to thee,
Have felt love's guardian power.

When looks were strange on every side,
When, gazing round, I only saw
Far-reaching ways, unknown and wide,
I could but nearer draw :

I could but nearer draw, and hold
Thy garment's border as I might,
This while I felt, my heart was bold,
My step was free and light.

Thou haply on my path the while
Didst seem unheeding me to fare,
Scarce now and then, by word or smile,
Owning a playmate there.

What matter? well I know my place,
Deep in my Mother's inmost heart :
I feared but, in my childish race,
I from her robe might part."

We are ourselves reminded of another image. We have somewhere seen some lines by Darwin, in which a mother is described as killed by a chance ball in a battle; her children are found clinging to her in the persuasion that she is asleep;—when she is discovered by those who know better, the poor babes say in surprise, "Why do you weep, mamma will soon awake." None other but that miraculous Voice, which used the same words over Jairus's daughter, can wake the dead.

There is one other issue, to which we have not yet drawn attention, to which Anglo-Catholic writers may reduce the inquiring mind;—they may throw it, by a reaction, into rationalism. When the opening heart and eager intellect find themselves led on by their teachers, as if by the hand, to the See of St. Peter, and then all of a sudden, without good reason assigned, they are stopped in their course, bid stand still in some half position, on the middle of a steep, or in the depth of a forest, the natural reflection which such a command excites is, "This is a mockery; I have come here for nothing; if I do not go on, I must go back." Of course such a feeling, though the natural, will not, and ought not to be, the first feeling of the young. Reverent minds will at first rest on the word of their teachers by the instinct of their natures, and will either receive them without examination, or accept on faith what does not approve itself to their reason. But as time proceeds, and the intellect becomes more manly, and has a greater hold of the subjects of thought and their relations to each other, it will at length come to feel that it

must form its own judgment on the questions which perplex it, unless the authority to which it has hitherto submitted claims to be infallible. To an infallible authority it will submit; but since no teacher of the Anglican Church, no, nor that Church itself, claims to have the power of absolutely determining the truth in religious matters, the moment must arrive when the young inquirer feels it right to have an opinion of his own, and then it is that a peremptory prohibition of his advancing onward, without sufficient reason assigned for it, will act as a violent temptation to recede. A forlorn feeling comes over the mind, as if after all there was nothing real in orthodoxy—as if it were a matter of words about which nothing is known, nothing can be proved—as if one opinion were as good as another. The whole Roman faith it thinks it could receive; but a half-and-half system, which both does and does not appeal to reason—which argues as far as it thinks argument tells in its favour, and denounces argument when it tells the other way—flies to authority, puts forward great names, and talks in a vague way of “reverence,” “submission,” “the Church of our baptism,” “rationalism,” “restlessness,” and the like, neither commands its faith nor wins its love. O that we could be sure about our author, that however he might think it his duty to treat the gentle and unlearned who depend on him, at least when men of independent minds, young or old, come to him in doubt—men of the world, or rising men of active minds, whose characters are yet undetermined (we are speaking in entire ignorance whether he has knowledge of such cases), what a blessing it would be to be able to think that, instead of placing an obstacle in the path of such, he felt himself at liberty to say to them as much as this: “Stay with us, if you do not risk your Christian faith and hope by staying; but, little as I can countenance your departure to the Church of Rome, better do so than become a rationalist.” This surely is not asking a very great deal.

As to the author personally, we cannot help cherishing one special trust, which we hope is not too sacred to put into words.

If there be one writer in the Anglican Church who has discovered a deep, tender, loyal devotion to the blessed Mary, it is the author of the *Christian Year*. The image of the Virgin and Child seems to be the one vision upon which both his heart and intellect have been formed; and those who knew Oxford twenty or thirty years ago, say that, while other college rooms were ornamented with pictures of Napoleon on horseback, or Apollo and the Graces, or Heads of Houses placed in easy-chairs, there were the rooms of one man, a young and rising one, in which might be seen the Madonna di Sisto or Domenichino's St. John—fit augury of him who was in the event to do so much for the revival of Catholicism. We will never give up the hope, the humble belief, that that sweet and gracious Lady will not forget her servant, but will recompense him, in royal wise, sevenfold,—bringing him and his at length into the Church of the One Saviour, and into the communion of herself and all saints whom He has redeemed.

THE MISSION OF THE BENEDICTINE ORDER.¹

AS the physical universe is sustained and carried on in dependence on certain centres of power and laws of operation, so the course of the social and political world, and of that great religious organisation called the Catholic Church, is found to proceed for the most part from the presence or action of definite persons, places, events, and institutions, as the visible cause of the whole. There has been but one Judæa, one Greece, one Rome; one Homer, one Cicero; one Cæsar, one Constantine, one Charlemagne. And so, as regards Revelation, there has been one St. John the Divine, one Doctor of the Nations. Dogma runs along the line of Athanasius, Augustine, Thomas. The conversion of the heathen is ascribed, after the Apostles, to champions of the truth so few, that we may almost count them, as Martin, Patrick, Augustine, Boniface. Then there is St. Antony, the father of monachism; St. Jerome, the interpreter of Scripture; St. Chrysostom, the great preacher.

Education follows the same law: it has its history in the Church, and its doctors or patriarchs in that history. This is the subject on which we propose to make some remarks in the pages which follow, taking Education in its broadest and most general sense, as the work contemplated in the august command, "Go, teach all nations," and as more or less connected with civilisation, social advance, the cultivation of learning, sacred and profane, and similar great facts, which are its historical interpretation.

The outline of what we have to say on the subject is simple enough; it is the filling up of details which will demand

¹ From *The Atlantis* for January 1858.

diligence in the writer, and patience in the reader. There are three main periods, then, of ecclesiastical history,—the ancient, the mediæval, and the modern; so far is plain: and there are three Religious Orders in those periods respectively, which succeed, one the other, on the public stage, and represent the teaching of the Catholic Church during the time of their ascendancy. The first period is that long series of centuries during which society was breaking, or had broken up, and then slowly attempted its own reconstruction; the second may be called the period of reconstruction; and the third dates from the Reformation, when that peculiar movement of mind commenced, the issue of which is still to come. Now, St. Benedict is the Patriarch of the ancient world; St. Dominic of the mediæval; and St. Ignatius of the modern. And in saying this, we are in no degree disrespectful to the Augustinians, Carmelites, Franciscans, and other great religious families which might be named; for we are not reviewing the whole history of Christianity, but selecting a particular aspect of it.

Perhaps as much as this will be granted to us without great hesitation. Next we proceed, after thus roughly mapping out our view of history, roughly to colour it, by way of contrasting these three patriarchs of Christian teaching with each other. To St. Benedict then, who may fairly be taken to represent the various families of monks before his time and those which sprang from him (for they are all pretty much of one school), to this great saint let us assign, for his discriminating badge, the Poetical; to St. Dominic, the Scientific; and to St. Ignatius, the Practical and Useful.

These characteristics, which belong respectively to the works of the three great Masters, grow out of the circumstances under which they respectively entered upon them. Benedict, entrusted with his mission almost as a boy, infused into it the romance and simplicity of boyhood. Dominic, a man of forty-five, a graduate in theology, a priest and a canon, brought with him into religion the maturity and completeness of learning, which he had acquired in the schools. Ignatius, a man of the world before his conversion, transmitted as a legacy to his disciples that know-

ledge of mankind which cannot be learned in cloisters. And thus the three several Orders were (so to say) begotten in Poetry, Science, and Good Sense.

And here another coincidence suggests itself. We have been giving these three attributes to the three Patriarchs severally, from a *bonâ fide* regard to their history, and without at all having any theory of philosophy in our eye. But, after having so described them, it certainly did strike us that we had unintentionally been illustrating a somewhat popular notion of the day, the like of which is attributed to authors with whom we have as little sympathy as with any persons who can be named. According to these speculators, the life, whether of a race or of an individual of the great human family, is divided into three stages, each of which has its own ruling principle and characteristic. The youth makes his start in life, with "*hope* at the prow, and *fancy* at the helm;" he has nothing else but these to impel or direct him; he has not lived long enough to exercise his reason, or to gather in a store of facts; and, because he cannot do otherwise, he dwells in a world which he has created. He begins with illusions. Now, facts are external to him, but his reason is his own: of the two, then, it is easier for him to exercise his reason than to ascertain facts. Accordingly, his first mental revolution, when he discards the life of aspiration and affection, which has disappointed him, and the dreams of which he has been the sport and victim, is to embrace a life of logic: this then is his second stage,—the metaphysical. He acts now on a plan, thinks by system, is cautious about his middle terms, and trusts nothing but what takes a scientific form. His third stage is when he has made full trial of life; when he has found his theories break down under the weight of facts, and experience falsify his most promising calculations. Then the old man recognises at length, that what he can taste, touch, and handle, is trustworthy, and nothing beyond it. Thus he runs through his three periods of Imagination, Reason, and Sense; and then he comes to an end, and is not;—a most impotent and melancholy conclusion.

We repeat, we have no sympathy in so heartless a view of

life, and yet it seems to square with what we have been saying of the three great Patriarchs of Christian teaching. And certainly there is a truth in it, which gives it its plausibility. However, we are not concerned here to do more than to put our finger on the point at which we diverge from it, in what we have been saying and must say concerning them. It is true, then, that history, as viewed in these three saints, is, somewhat after the manner of the theory we have mentioned, a progress from poetry through science to practical sense or prudence; but then this important *proviso* has to be borne in mind at the same time, that what the Catholic Church once has had, she never has lost. She has never wept over, or been angry with, time gone and over. Instead of passing from one stage of life to another, she has carried her youth and middle age along with her, on to her latest time. She has not changed possessions, but accumulated them, and has brought out of her treasure-house, according to the occasion, things new and old. She did not lose Benedict by finding Dominic; and she has still both Benedict and Dominic at home, though she has become the mother of Ignatius. Imagination, Science, Prudence, all are good, and she has them all. Things incompatible in nature, coexist in her; her prose is poetical on the one hand, and philosophical on the other.

Coming now to the historical proof of the contrast we have been instituting, we are sanguine in thinking that one branch of it is already allowed by the consent of the world, and is undeniable. By common consent, the palm of Prudence, in the full sense of that comprehensive word, belongs to the School of Religion, of which St. Ignatius is the Founder. That great Society is the classical seat and fountain of discretion, practical sense, and wise government. Sublimier conceptions or more profound speculations may have been elaborated elsewhere; but, whether we consider the illustrious Body in its own constitution, or in its rules for instruction and direction, we see that it is its very genius to prefer this most excellent prudence to every other gift, and to think little both of poetry and of science, unless they happen to be useful. It is true that, in the long catalogue

of its members, there are to be found the names of the most consummate theologians, and of scholars the most elegant and accomplished; but we are speaking here, not of individuals, but of the body itself. It is plain, that the body is not over-jealous about its theological conditions; or it certainly would not suffer Suarez to controvert with Molina, Viva with Vasquez, Passaglia with Petavius, and Faure with Suarez, De Lugo, and Valentia. In this intellectual freedom its members justly glory; inasmuch as they have set their affections, not on the opinions of the Schools, but on the souls of men. And it is the same charitable motive which makes them give up the poetry of life, the poetry of ceremonies,—of the cowl, the cloister, and the choir,—content with the most prosaic architecture, if it be but convenient, and the most prosaic neighbourhood, if it be but populous. We need not then dwell longer on this wonderful Religion, but may confine the remarks which are to follow, to the two Religions which historically preceded it—the Benedictine and the Dominican.

One preliminary more, suggested by a purely fanciful analogy:—As there are three great Patriarchs on the high road and public thoroughfare of Christian History, so there were three chief Patriarchs in the first age of the chosen people. Putting aside Noe and Melchisedec, and Joseph and his brethren, we recognise three venerable fathers,—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: Abraham, the father of many nations; Isaac the intellectual, living in solitary simplicity, and in loving contemplation; and Jacob, the persecuted and helpless, visited by marvellous providences, driven from place to place, set down and taken up again, ill-treated by those who were his debtors, and maligned when he is innocent, yet carried on and triumphing amid all troubles by means of his most faithful and powerful guardian-archangel. We are exempted, by what has gone before, from the duty of completing our parallel, in the instance of Jacob; but, as to Benedictines and Dominicans, we shall introduce them successively under the type, as it may be called, of Abraham and Isaac.

St. Benedict, like the great Hebrew Patriarch, was the “Father of many nations.” He has been styled “the Patriarch

of the West," a title which there are many reasons for ascribing to him. Not only was he the first to establish a perpetual Order of Regulars in Western Christendom; not only, as coming first, has he had an ampler course of centuries for the multiplication of his children; but his Rule, as that of St. Basil in the East, is the normal rule of the first ages of the Church, and was in time generally received even in communities which in no sense owed their origin to him. Moreover, out of his Order rose, in process of time, various new monastic families, which have established themselves as independent institutions, and are able to boast in their turn of the number of their houses, and the sanctity and historical celebrity of their members. He is the representative of Latin monachism for the long extent of six centuries, while monachism was one; and even when at length varieties arose, and distinct titles were given to them, the change grew out of him;—not the act of strangers who were his rivals, but of his own children, who did but make a new beginning in all devotion and loyalty to him. He died in the early half of the sixth century; at the beginning of the tenth rose from among his French monasteries the famous Congregation of Cluni, illustrated by St. Majolus, St. Odilo, Peter the Venerable, and other considerable personages, among whom is Hildebrand, afterwards Pope Gregory the Seventh. Then came, in long succession, the Orders or Congregations of Camaldoli under St. Romuald, of Vallombrosa, of Citeaux, to which St. Bernard has given his name, of Monte Vergine, of Fontvrault; those of England, Spain, and Flanders; the Silvestrines, the Celestines, the Olivetans, the Humiliati, besides a multitude of institutes for women, as the Gilbertines and the Oblates of St. Frances, and then at length, to mention no others, the Congregation of St. Maur in modern times, so well known for its biblical, patristical, and historical works, and for its learned members, Montfaucon, Mabillon, and their companions. The panegyrists of this illustrious Order are accustomed to claim for it in all its branches as many as thirty-seven thousand houses, and, besides numerous Popes, 200 Cardinals, 4 Emperors, 46 Kings, 51 Queens, 1,406 Princes,

1,600 Archbishops, 600 Bishops, 2,400 Nobles, and 15,000 Abbots and learned men.¹

Nor are the religious bodies which sprang from St. Benedict the full measure of what he has accomplished,—as has been already observed. His Rule gradually made its way into those various monasteries, which were of an earlier or an independent foundation. It first coalesced with, and then supplanted, the Irish Rule of St. Columban in France, and the still older institutes which had been brought from the East by St. Athanasius, St. Eusebius, and St. Martin. At the beginning of the ninth century it was formally adopted throughout the dominions of Charlemagne. Pure, or with some admixture, it was brought by St. Augustine to England; and that admixture, if it existed, was gradually eliminated by St. Wilfrid, St. Dunstan, and Lanfranc, till at length it was received, with the name and obedience of St. Benedict, in all the Cathedral monasteries² (to make no mention of others), excepting Carlisle. Nor did it cost such regular bodies any very great effort to make the change, even when historically most separate from St. Benedict; for the Saint had taken up for the most part what he found, and his Rule was but the expression of the genius of monachism in those first ages of the Church, with a more exact adaptation to their needs than could elsewhere be found.

So uniform indeed had been the monastic idea before his time, and so little stress had been laid by individual communities on their respective peculiarities, that religious men passed at pleasure from one body to another.³ St. Benedict provides in his Rule for the case of strangers coming to one of his houses, and wishing to remain there. If such a one came from any monastery with which the monks had existing relations, then he was not to be received without letters from his

¹ Helyot, *Hist. Mon.* Ziegelbauer, *Litt. Hist.* Soame's *Mosheim*, vol. ii. p. 26. Buckingham's *Bible in the Middle Ages*, p. 81, etc., etc.

² Butler, June 22.

³ Thomassin, *Disc. Eccl.*, t. i. p. 705. Calmet, *Reg. Ben.*, t. ii. p. 25. Mabillon, *Acta Sæc.*, iv. p. 1; præf., p. xxx. *Annal.*, t. i. præf., § 19.

Abbot; but, in the instance of "a foreign monk from distant parts," who wished to dwell with them as a guest, and was content with their ways, and conformed himself to them, and was not troublesome, "should he in the event wish to stay for good," says St. Benedict, "let him not be refused; for there has been room to make trial of him, during the time that hospitality has been shown him: nay, let him even be invited to stay, that others may gain a lesson from his example; for in every place we are servants of one Lord and soldiers of one King."¹

The unity which these words imply as the distinctive token of a monk in every part of Christendom, may be described as a unity of object, of state, and of occupation. Monachism was one and the same everywhere, because it was a reaction from that secular life which has everywhere the same structure and the same characteristics. And, since that secular life contained in it many objects, many states, and many occupations, here was a special reason, as a matter of principle, why the reaction from it should bear the badge of unity, and should be in outward appearance one and the same everywhere. Moreover, since that same secular life was, when monachism arose, more than ordinarily marked by variety, perturbation, and confusion, it seemed on that very account to justify emphatically a rising and revolt against itself, and a recurrence to some state, which, unlike itself, was constant and unalterable. It was indeed an old, decayed, and moribund world, into which Christianity had been cast. The social fabric was overgrown with the corruptions of a thousand years, and was held together, not so much by any common principle, as by the strength of possession and the tenacity of custom. It was too large for public spirit, and too artificial for patriotism, and its many religions did but foster in the popular mind division and scepticism. Want of mutual confidence would lead to despondency, inactivity, and selfishness. Society was in the slow fever of consumption, which made it restless in proportion as it was feeble. It was powerful, however, to seduce and deprave; nor was there any *locus standi* from which to combat its evils; and the only way of getting

¹ *Reg.*, c. 61.

on with it was to abandon principle and duty, to take things as they came, and to do as the world did. Worse than all, this encompassing, entangling system of things was, at the time we speak of, the seat and instrument of a paganism, and then of heresies, not simply contrary, but bitterly hostile, to the Christian name. Serious men not only had a call, but every inducement which love of life and freedom could inspire, to escape from its presence and its sway.

Their one idea then, their one purpose, was to be quit of it; too long had it enthralled them. It was not a question of this or that vocation, of the better deed, of the higher state, but of life and death. In other times a variety of holy objects might present themselves for devotion to choose from, such as the care of the poor, or of the sick, or of the young, the redemption of captives, or the conversion of the barbarians; but early monachism was flight from the world, and nothing else. The troubled, jaded, weary heart, the stricken, laden conscience, sought a life free from corruption in its daily work, free from distraction in its daily worship; and it sought employments, as contrary as possible to the world's employments,—employments, the end of which would be in themselves, in which each day, each hour, would have its own completeness;—no elaborate undertakings, no difficult aims, no anxious ventures, no uncertainties to make the heart beat, or the temples throb, no painful combination of efforts, no extended plan of operations, no multiplicity of details, no deep calculations, no sustained machinations, no suspense, no vicissitudes, no moments of crisis or catastrophe;—nor again any subtle investigations, nor perplexities of proof, nor conflicts of rival intellects, to agitate, harass, depress, stimulate, weary, or intoxicate the soul.

Hitherto we have been using negatives to describe what the primitive monk was seeking; in truth monachism was, as regards the secular life and all that it implies, emphatically a negation, or, to use another word, a *mortification*; a mortification of sense, and a mortification of reason. Here a word of explanation is necessary. The monks were too good Catholics to deny that reason was a divine gift, and had too much common

sense to think to do without it. What they denied themselves was the various and manifold exercises of the reason; and on this account, because such exercises were excitements. When the reason is cultivated, it at once begins to combine, to centralise, to look forward, to look back, to view things as a whole, whether for speculation or for action; it practises synthesis and analysis, it discovers, it invents. To these exercises of the intellect is opposed simplicity, which is the state of mind which does not combine, does not deal with premisses and conclusions, does not recognise means and their end, but lets each work, each place, each occurrence stand by itself,—which acts towards each as it comes before it, without a thought of anything else. This simplicity is the temper of children, and it is the temper of monks. This was their mortification of the intellect; every man who lives must live by reason, as every one must live by sense; but, as it is possible to be content with the bare necessities of animal life, so is it possible to confine ourselves to the bare ordinary use of reason, without caring to improve it or make the most of it. These monks held both sense and reason to be the gifts of heaven, but they used each of them as little as they could help, reserving their full time and their whole selves for devotion;—for, if reason is better than sense, so devotion they thought to be better than either; and, as even a heathen might deny himself the innocent indulgences of sense in order to give his time to the cultivation of the reason, so did the monks give up reason, as well as sense, that they might consecrate themselves to divine meditation.

Now, then, we are able to understand how it was that the monks had a unity, and in what it consisted. It was a unity, we have said, of object, of taste, and of occupation. Their object was rest and peace; their state was retirement; their occupation was some work that was simple, as opposed to intellectual, viz., prayer, fasting, meditation, study, transcription, manual labour, and other unexciting, soothing employments. Such was their institution all over the world; they had eschewed the busy mart, the craft of gain, the money-changer's bench, and the merchant's cargo. They had turned their backs upon

the wrangling forum, the political assembly, and the pan-technicon of trades. They had had their last dealings with architect and habit-maker, with butcher and cook; all they wanted, all they desired, was the sweet soothing presence of earth, sky, and sea, the hospitable cave, the bright running stream, the easy gifts which mother earth, "justissima tellus," yields on every little persuasion. "The monastic institute," says the biographer of St. Maurus, "*demandes the most perfect quietness;*"¹ and where was quietness to be found, if not in reverting to the original condition of man, as far as the changed circumstances of our race admitted, in having no wants of which the supply was not close at hand; in the "nil admirari;" in having neither hope nor fear of anything below; in daily prayer, daily bread, and daily work, one day being just like another, except that it was one step nearer than the day before it to that great Day, which would swallow up all days, the day of everlasting rest?

However, we have come into collision with a great authority, M. Guizot, and we must stop the course of our argument to make our ground good against him. M. Guizot, then, makes a distinction between monachism in its birthplace, in Egypt and Syria, and that Western institute, of which we have made St. Benedict the representative. He allows that the Orientals mortified the intellect, but he considers that Latin monachism was the seat of considerable mental activity. "The desire for retirement," he says, "for contemplation, for a marked rupture with civilised society, was the source and fundamental trait of the Eastern monks: in the West, *on the contrary*, and especially in Southern Gaul, where, at the commencement of the fifth century, the principal monasteries were founded, it was in order to live in common, *with a view to conversation* as well as to religious edification, that the first monks met. The monasteries of Lerins, of St. Victor, and many others, were especially great schools of theology, the focus of intellectual movement. It was by no means with solitude or with mortification, but with discussion and activity, that they there concerned

¹ Mabillon, *Act. Benedict.*, t. iv. p. 1, p. xxxvii.

themselves.”¹ Great deference is due to an author so learned, so philosophical, so honestly desirous to set out Christianity to the best advantage; yet, we are at a loss to understand what has led him to make such a distinction between the East and West, and to assign to the Western monks an activity of intellect, and to the Eastern a love of retirement.

It is quite true that instances are sometimes to be found of monasteries in the West, distinguished by much intellectual activity, but more, and more striking, instances are to be found of a like phenomenon in the East. If, then, such particular instances are to be taken as fair specimens of the state of Western monachism, they are equally fair specimens of the state of Eastern also; and the Eastern monks will be proved more intellectual than the Western, by virtue of that greater interest in doctrine and in controversy which given individuals or communities among them have exhibited. A very cursory reference to ecclesiastical history will be sufficient to show us that the fact is as we have stated it. The theological sensitiveness of the monks of Marseilles, Lerins, or Adrumetum, it seems, is to be a proof of the intellectualism generally of the West: then, why is not the greater sensitiveness of the Scythian monks at Constantinople, and of their opponents the Acœmetæ, an evidence in favour of the East? These two bodies of Religious Orders actually came all the way from Constantinople to Rome to denounce one another, besieging, as it were, the Holy See, and the former of them actually attempting to raise the Roman populace against the Pope, in behalf of its own theological *ter.et.* Does not this show activity of mind? We venture to say, that, for one intellectual monk in the West, a dozen might be produced in the East. The very reproach, so freely thrown out by secular historians against the Greeks, of over-subtlety of intellect, applies, if to any men, to certain classes or certain communities of Eastern monks. Sometimes they were enthusiastically orthodox, quite as often furiously heretical. If Pelagius be a monk in the West, on the other hand, Nestorius and Eutyches, both heresiarchs, are both

¹ *History of Civilization*, vol. ii. p. 65, Bohn.

monks in the East; and Eutyches, at the time of his heresy, was an old monk into the bargain, who had been thirty years abbot of a convent, and whom age, if not sanctity, might have saved from this abnormal use of his reason. His partisans were principally monks of Egypt; and they, coming up in force to the pseudo-synod of Ephesus, kicked to death the Patriarch of Constantinople, and put to flight the Legate of the Pope, and all this out of a keen susceptibility about an intellectual opinion. A century earlier, Arius, on starting, carried away into his heresy as many as seven hundred nuns;¹ what have the Western convents to show, in the way of controversial activity, comparable with a fact like this? We do not insist on the zealous and influential orthodoxy of the monks of Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor in the fourth century, because it was probably nothing else but an honourable adhesion to the faith of the Church; but turn to the great writers of Eastern Christendom, and consider how many of them at first sight are monks:—Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Ephrem, Amphilochius, Isidore of Pelusium, Theodore, Theodoret, perhaps Athanasius. Among the Latin writers no names occur to us but those of Jerome and Pope Gregory; we may add Paulinus, Sulpicius, and Cassian, but Jerome is the only learned writer among them. We have a difficulty, then, in comprehending, not to speak of admitting, M. Guizot's assertion, a writer who does not commonly speak without a meaning or a reason.

But, after all, however the balance of intellectualism may lie between certain convents or individuals in the East and the West, such particular instances are nothing to the purpose, when taken to measure the state of the great body of the monks; certainly not in the West, with which in this paper we are exclusively concerned. In taking an estimate of the Benedictines, we need not trouble ourselves about the state of monachism in Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and Constantinople, at least after the fourth century, by the end of which time the tradition had passed from the East to the West. Now, the

¹ *Epiph. Hær.* 69.

Eastern monks of the fourth century simply follow the defined and promulgated doctrine of the Church; their intellectualism proper begins with the fifth. Taking, then, the great tradition of St. Antony, St. Pachomius, and St. Basil in the East, and tracing it into the West by the hands of St. Athanasius, St. Martin, and their contemporaries, we shall find no historical facts but what admit of a fair explanation, consistent with the views which we have laid down above about monastic simplicity, bearing in mind always, what holds in all matters of fact, that there never was a rule without its exceptions.

Every rule has its exceptions; but, further than this, when exceptions occur, they are likely to be great ones. This is no paradox; illustrations of it are to be found everywhere. For instance, we may conceive a climate very fatal to children, and yet those who escape growing up to be strong men; and for a plain reason, because those alone could have passed the ordeal who had robust constitutions. Thus the Romans, so jealous of their freedom, when they resolved on the appointment of a supreme ruler for an occasion, did not do the thing by halves, but made him a Dictator. In like manner, a trifling occurrence, or an ordinary inward impulse, will be powerless to snap the bond which keeps the monk fast to his cell, his oratory, and his garden. Exceptions, indeed, may be few, because they *are* exceptions, but they will be great. It must be a serious emergence, a particular inspiration, a sovereign command, which brings the monk into political life; and he will be sure to make a great figure in it, else why should he have been torn from his cloister at all? This will account for the career of St. Gregory the Seventh or of St. Dunstan, of St. Bernard or of Abbot Suger, as far as it was political: the work they had to do was such as none could have done but a monk with his superhuman single-mindedness and his pertinacity of purpose. Again, in the case of St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, and in that of others of the missionaries of his age, it seems to have been a particular inspiration which carried them abroad; and it is observable after all how soon most of them settled down into the mixed character of agriculturists and pastors in their new

country, and resumed the tranquil life to which they had originally devoted themselves. As to the early Greek Fathers, some of those whom we have instanced above are only *prima facie* exceptions, as Chrysostom, who, though he lived with the monks most austere for as many as six years, can hardly be said to have taken on himself the responsibilities of their condition, or to have simply abandoned the world. Others of them, as Basil, were scholars, philosophers, men of the world, before they were monks, and could not put off their cultivation of mind or their learning with their secular dress; and these would be the very men, in an age when such talents were scarce, who would be taken out of their retirement by superior authority, and who therefore cannot fairly be quoted as ordinary specimens of the monastic life.

Exceptio probat regulam: let us see what two Doctors of the Church, one Greek, one Latin, both rulers, both monks, say concerning the state, which they at one time enjoyed, and afterwards lost. "You tell me," says St. Basil, writing to a friend from his solitude, "that it was little for me to describe the place of my retirement, unless I mentioned also my habits and my mode of life; yet really I am ashamed to tell you how I pass night and day in this lonely nook. I am like one who is angry with the size of his vessel, as tossing overmuch, and leaves it for the boat, and is sea-sick and miserable still. However, what I propose to do is as follows, with the hope of tracing His steps who has said, 'If any one will come after Me, let him deny himself.' We must strive after a quiet mind. As well might the eye ascertain an object which is before it, while it roves up and down without looking steadily at it, as a mind, distracted with a thousand worldly cares, be able clearly to apprehend the truth. One who is not yoked in matrimony, is harassed by rebellious impulses and hopeless attachments; he who is married, is involved in his own tumult of cares: is he without children? he covets them; has he children? he has anxieties about their education. Then there is solicitude about his life, care of his house, oversight of his servants, misfortunes in trade, differences with his neighbours, lawsuits, the merchant's risks,

the farmer's toil. Each day, as it comes, darkens the soul in its own way; and night after night takes up the day's anxieties, and cheats us with corresponding dreams. Now, the only way of escaping all this is separation from the whole world, so as to live without city, home, goods, society, possessions, means of life, business, engagements, secular learning, that the heart may be prepared as wax for the impress of divine teaching. Solitude is of the greatest use for this purpose, as it stills our passions, and enables reason to extirpate them. Let then a place be found, such as mine, separate from intercourse with men, that the tenor of our exercises be not interrupted from without. Pious exercises nourish the soul with divine thoughts. Soothing hymns compose the mind to a cheerful and calm state. Quiet, then, as I have said, is the first step in our sanctification; the tongue purified from the gossip of the world, the eyes unexcited by fair colour or comely shape, the ear secured from the relaxation of voluptuous songs, and that especial mischief, light jesting. Thus, the mind, rescued from dissipation from without, and sensible allurements, falls back upon itself, and thence ascends to the contemplation of God."¹ It is quite clear that at least St. Basil took the same view of the monastic state as we have done.

So much for the East in the fourth century; now for the West in the seventh. "One day," says St. Gregory, after he had been constrained, against his own wish, to leave his cloister for the government of the Universal Church, "one day, when I was oppressed with the excessive trouble of secular affairs, I sought a retired place, friendly to grief, where whatever displeased me in my occupations might show itself, and all that was wont to inflict pain might be seen at one view." While he was in this retreat, his most dear son, Peter, with whom, since the latter was a youth, he had been intimate, surprised him, and he opened his grief to him. "My sad mind," he said, "labouring under the soreness of its engagements, remembers how it went with me formerly in this monastery, how

¹ *Ep.* 2.

all perishable things were beneath it, how it rose above all that was transitory, and, though still in the flesh, went out in contemplation beyond that prison, so that it even loved death, which is commonly thought a punishment, as the gate of life and the reward of labour. But now, in consequence of the pastoral charge, it undergoes the busy work of secular men, and for that fair beauty of its quiet, is dishonoured with the dust of the earth. And often dissipating itself in outward things, to serve the many, even when it seeks what is inward, it comes home indeed, but is no longer what it used to be.”¹ Here is the very same view of the monastic state at Rome, which St. Basil had in Pontus—viz., retirement and repose. There have been great Religious Orders since, whose atmosphere has been conflict, and who have thriven in smiting or in being smitten. It has been their high calling ; it has been their peculiar meritorious service ; but, as for the Benedictine, the very air he breathes is peace.

We have now said enough both to explain and to vindicate the biographer of St. Maurus, when he says that the object, and life, and reward of the ancient monachism is “*summa quies*,”—the absence of all excitement, sensible and intellectual, and the vision of Eternity. And therefore have we called the monastic state the most poetical of religious disciplines. It was a return to that primitive age of the world, of which poets have so often sung, the simplicity of Arcadia or the reign of Saturn, when fraud and violence were unknown. It was a bringing back of those real, not fabulous, scenes of innocence and miracle, when Adam delved, or Abel kept sheep, or Noe planted the vine, and Angels visited them. It was a fulfilment in the letter, of the glowing imagery of prophets, about the evangelical period. Nature for art, the wide earth and majestic heavens for the crowded city, the subdued and docile beasts of the field for the wild passions and rivalries of social life, tranquillity for ambition and care, divine meditation for the exploits of the intellect, the Creator for the creature, such was the normal condition of the monk. He had tried the world

¹ *Dial.* i. 1.

and found its hollowness; or he had eluded its fellowship, before it had solicited him;—and so St. Antony fled to the desert, and St. Hilarion sought the sea-shore, and St. Basil ascended the mountain ravine, and St. Benedict took refuge in his cave, and St. Giles buried himself in the forest, and St. Martin chose the broad river, in order that the world might be shut out of view, and the soul might be at rest. And such a rest of intellect and of passion as this is full of the elements of the poetical.

We have no intention of committing ourselves here to a definition of poetry; we may be thought wrong in the use of the term; but, if we explain what we mean by it, no harm is done, whatever be our inaccuracy, and each reader may substitute for it some word he likes better. Poetry, then, we conceive, whatever be its metaphysical essence, or however various may be its kinds, whether it more properly belongs to action or to suffering, nay, whether it is more at home with society or with nature, whether its spirit is seen to best advantage in Homer or in Virgil, at any rate, is always the antagonist to *science*. As science makes progress in any subject-matter, poetry recedes from it. The two cannot stand together; they belong respectively to two modes of viewing things, which are contradictory of each other. Reason investigates, analyses, numbers, weighs, measures, ascertains, locates, the objects of its contemplation, and thus gains a scientific knowledge of them. Science results in system, which is complex unity; poetry delights in the indefinite and various as contrasted with unity, and in the simple as contrasted with system. The aim of science is to get a hold of things, to grasp them, to handle them, to comprehend them; that is (to use the familiar term), to *master* them, or to be superior to them. Its success lies in being able to draw a line round them, and to tell where each of them is to be found within that circumference, and how each lies relatively to all the rest. Its mission is to destroy ignorance, doubt, surmise, suspense, illusions, fears, deceits, according to the "*Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*" of the Poet, whose whole passage, by the way, may be taken as drawing

out the contrast between the poetical and the scientific.¹ But as to the poetical, very different is the frame of mind which is necessary for its perception. It demands, as its primary condition, that we should not put ourselves above the objects in which it resides, but at their feet ; that we should feel them to be above and beyond us, that we should look up to them, and that, instead of fancying that we can comprehend them, we should take for granted that we are surrounded and comprehended by them ourselves. It implies that we understand them to be vast, immeasurable, impenetrable, inscrutable, mysterious ; so that at best we are only forming conjectures about them, not conclusions, for the phenomena which they present admit of many explanations, and we cannot know the true one. Poetry does not address the reason, but the imagination and affections ; it leads to admiration, enthusiasm, devotion, love. The vague, the uncertain, the irregular, the sudden, are among its attributes or sources. Hence it is that a child's mind is so full of poetry, because he knows so little ; and an old man of the world so devoid of poetry, because his experience of facts is so wide. Hence it is that nature is commonly more poetical than art, in spite of Lord Byron, because it is less comprehensible and less patient of definitions ; history more poetical than philosophy ; the savage than the citizen ; the knight-errant than the brigadier-general ; the winding bridle-path than the straight railroad ; the sailing vessel than the steamer ; the ruin than the spruce suburban box ; the Turkish robe or Spanish doublet than the French dress coat. We have said far more than enough to make it clear what we mean

¹ Me vero primum dulces ante omnia Musæ . . .
 Accipiant, *cælique vias et sidera monstrent*, etc., etc.
 Sin, has ne possim naturæ accedere partes,
 Frigidus obstiterit circum præcordia sanguis,
Rura mihi et rigui placeant in vallibus amnes, etc.

And so again—

Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere *causas*, etc.
Fortunatus et ille, Deos qui novit *agrestes*, etc.

by that element in the old monastic life, to which we have given the name of the Poetical.

Now, in many ways the family of St. Benedict answers to this description, as we shall see if we look into its history. Its spirit indeed is ever one, but not its outward circumstances. It is not an Order proceeding from one mind at a particular date, and appearing all at once in its full perfection, and in its extreme development, and in form one and the same everywhere, and from first to last, as is the case with other great religious institutions ; but it is an organisation, diverse, complex, and irregular, and variously ramified, rich rather than symmetrical, with many origins and centres and new beginnings and the action of local influences, like some great natural growth ; with tokens, on the face of it, of its being a divine work, not the mere creation of human genius. Instead of progressing on plan and system and from the will of a superior, it has shot forth and run out as if spontaneously, and has shaped itself according to events, from an irrepressible fulness of life within, and from the energetic self-action of its parts, like those symbolical creatures in the prophet's vision, which "went every one of them straight forward, whither the impulse of the spirit was to go." It has been poured out over the earth, rather than been sent, with a silent, mysterious operation, while men slept, and through the romantic adventures of individuals, which are well-nigh without record ; and thus it has come down to us, not risen up among us, and is found rather than established. Its separate and scattered monasteries occupy the land, each in its place, with a majesty parallel, but superior, to that of old aristocratic houses. Their known antiquity, their unknown origin, their long eventful history, their connection with Saints and Doctors when on earth, the legends which hang about them, their rival ancestral honours, their extended sway, perhaps, over other religious houses, their hold upon the associations of the neighbourhood, their traditional friendships and compacts with other great landlords, the benefits they have conferred, the sanctity which they breathe, these and the like attributes make them objects at once of awe and of affection.

Such is the great Abbey of Bobio, in the Apennines, where St. Columban came to die, having issued with his twelve monks from his convent in Bensor, county Down, and having spent his life in preaching godliness and planting monasteries in half heathen France and Burgundy. Such St. Gall's, on the lake of Constance, so called from another Irishman, one of St. Columban's companions, who remained in Switzerland, when his master went on into Italy. Such the Abbey of Fulda, where lies St. Boniface, who, burning with zeal for the conversion of the Germans, attempted them a first time and failed, and then a second time and succeeded, and at length crowned the missionary labours of forty-five years with martyrdom. Such Monte Cassino, the metropolis of the Benedictine name, where the Saint broke the idol, and cut down the grove, of Apollo. Ancient houses such as these subdue the mind by the mingled grandeur and sweetness of their presence. They stand in history with an accumulated interest upon them, which belongs to no other monuments of the past. Whatever there is of venerable authority in other foundations, in Bishops' sees, in Cathedrals, in Colleges, respectively, is found in combination in them. Each gate and cloister has had its own story, and time has engraven upon their walls the chronicle of its revolutions. And, even when at length rudely destroyed, or crumbled into dust, they live in history and antiquarian works, in the pictures and relics which remain of them, and in the traditions of their place.

In the early part of last century the Maurist Fathers, with a view of collecting materials for the celebrated works which they had then on hand, sent two of their number on a tour through France and the adjacent provinces. Among other districts the travellers passed through the forest of Ardennes, which has been made classical by the prose of Cæsar and the poetry of Shakespeare. There they found the great Benedictine Convent of St. Hubert;¹ and, if we dwell a while upon the

¹ *Voyage Littéraire. Vide* also Calmet, *Lorraine*, t. i. p. 1043. Moreri, art. S. Hubert, *Gallia Christ.*, t. iii. p. 966. Mabillon, *Annal. Bened.*, t. ii. pp. 16, 441, 606. Bucherii, *Gest. Tungr.*, etc., t. i. p. 153. Helyot, *Ordres Mon.*, t. vi. p. 296.

illustration which it affords of what we have been saying, it is not as if twenty other religious houses which they visited would not serve our purpose quite as well, but because it has come first to our hand in turning over the pages of their volume. At that time the venerable abbey in question had upon it the weight of a thousand years, and was eminent above others in the country in wealth, in privileges, in name, and, not the least recommendation, in the sanctity of its members. The lands, on which it was situated, were its freehold, and their range included sixteen villages. The old chronicle informs us that, about the middle of the seventh century, St. Sigibert, the Merovingian, pitched upon Ardennes and its neighbourhood for the establishment of as many as twelve monasteries, with the hope of thereby obtaining from heaven an heir to his crown. Dying prematurely, he but partially fulfilled his pious intention, which was taken up by Pepin, sixty years afterwards, at the instance of his chaplain, St. Beregise ; so far, at least, as to make a commencement of the abbey of which we are speaking. Beregise had been a monk of the Benedictine Abbey of St. Tron, and he chose for its site a spot in the midst of the forest, marked by the ruins of a temple dedicated to the pagan Diana, the goddess of the chase. The holy man exorcised the place with the sign of the Cross ; and, becoming abbot of the new house, filled it either with monks, or as seems less likely, with secular canons. From that time to the summer day when the two Maurists visited it, the sacred foundation, with various fortunes, had been in possession of the land.

On entering its precincts, they found it at once full and empty : empty of the monks, who were in the fields gathering in the harvest ; full of pilgrims, who were wont to come day after day, in never-failing succession, to visit the tomb of St. Hubert. What a series of events has to be recorded to make this simple account intelligible ! and how poetical is the picture which it sets before us, as well as those events themselves, which it presupposes, when they come to be detailed ! Were it not that we should be swelling a passing illustration into a history, we might

go on to tell how strict the observance of the monks had been for the last hundred years before the travellers arrived there, since Abbot Nicholas de Fanson had effected a reform on the pattern of the French Congregation of St. Vanne. We might relate how, when a simple monk in the Abbey of St. Hubert, Nicholas had wished to change it for a stricter community, and how he got leave to go off to the Congregation just mentioned, and how then his old Abbot died suddenly, and how he himself to his surprise was elected in his place. And we might tell how, when his mitre was on his head, he set about reforming the house which he had been on the point of quitting, and how he introduced for that purpose two monks of St. Vanne ; and how the Bishop of Liège, in whose diocese he was, set himself against this holy design, and how some of the old monks attempted to poison him ; and how, though he carried it into effect, still he was not allowed to aggregate his Abbey to the Congregation whose reform he had adopted ; and how his good example encouraged the neighbouring abbeys to commence a reform in themselves, which issued in an ecclesiastical union of the Flemish Benedictines.

All this, however, would not have been more than one passage, of course, in the adventures which had befallen the abbey and its abbots in the course of its history. It had had many seasons of decay before the time of Nicholas de Fanson, and many restorations, and from different quarters. None of them was so famous or important as the reform effected in the year 817, about a century after its original foundation, when the secular canons were put out, and the monks put in, at the instance of the then Bishop of Liège, who had a better spirit than his successor in the time of Nicholas. The new inmates were joined by some persons of noble birth from the Cathedral, and by their suggestion and influence the bold measure was taken of attempting to gain from Liège the body of the great St. Hubert, the Apostle of Ardennes. Great, we may be sure, was the resistance of the city where he lay ; but Abbot Alreus, the friend and fellow-workman of St. Benedict of Anian, the first Reformer of the Order before the date of Cluni, went to the Bishop, and he went

to the Archbishop of Cologne; and then both prelates went to the Emperor Louis le Debonnaire, the son of Charlemagne, whose favourite hunting ground the forest was; and he referred the matter to the great Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, whence a decision came in favour of the monks of Ardennes. So with great solemnity the sacred body was conveyed by water to its new destination; and there in the Treasury, in memorial of the happy event, the Maurist visitors saw the very chalice of gold, and the beautiful copy of the Gospels, ornamented with precious stones, given to the Abbey by Louis at the time. Doubtless it was the handiwork of the monks of some other Benedictine House, as must have been the famous Psalter, of which the visitors speak also, written in letters of gold, the gift of Louis's son, the Emperor Lothaire; and there he sits in the first page, with his crown on his head, his sceptre in one hand, his sheathed sword in the other, and something very like a fleur-de-lys buckling on his ermine robe at the shoulder:—which precious gift, that is, the Psalter with all its pictures, two centuries after came most unaccountably into the possession of the Lady Helvidia of Aspurg, who gave it to her young son Bruno, afterwards Pope Leo the Ninth, to learn the Psalms by; but, as the young Saint made no progress in his task, she came to the conclusion that she had no right to the book, and so she ended by making a pilgrimage to St. Hubert with Bruno, and not only gave back the Psalter, but made the offering of a Sacramentary besides.

But to return to the relics of the Saint; the sacred body was taken by water up the Maes. The coffin was of marble, and perhaps could have been taken no other way; but another reason, besides its weight, lay in the indignation of the citizens of Liège, who made several attempts, in the following years, to regain the body. In consequence, the good monks of Ardennes hid it within the walls of their monastery, confiding the secret of its whereabouts to only two of their community at a time; and they showed in the sacristy to the devout, instead, the Saint's ivory cross and his stole, the sole of his shoe and his comb, and Diana, Marchioness of Autrech, gave a golden box to hold the

stole. This, however, was in after times ; for they were very loath at first to let strangers within their cloisters at all ; and in 838, when a long spell of rain was destroying the crops, and the people of the neighbourhood came in procession to the shrine to ask the intercession of the Saint, the cautious Abbot Sewold, availing himself of the Rule, would only admit priests, and them by threes and fours, with naked feet, and a few laymen with each of them. The supplicants were good men, however, and had no notion of playing any trick ; they came in piety and devotion, and the rain ceased, and the country was the gainer by St. Hubert of Ardennes. And thenceforth others, besides the monks, became interested in his stay in the forest.

And now we have said something in explanation why the courtyard was full of pilgrims, when the travellers came. St. Hubert had been an object of devotion for a particular benefit, perhaps ever since he came there, certainly as early as the eleventh century, for we then have historical notice of it. His preference of the forest to the city, which he had shown in life before his conversion, was illustrated by the particular grace or miraculous service, for which, more than for any other, he used his glorious intercession on high. He is famous for curing those who had suffered from the bite of wild animals, especially dogs of the chase, and a hospital was attached to the Abbey for their reception. The sacristan of the Church officiated in the cure ; and with rites which never indeed failed, but which to some cautious persons seemed to savour of superstition. Certainly they were startling at first sight ; accordingly a formal charge on that score was at one time brought against them before the Bishop of Liège, and a process followed. The Bishop, the University of Louvain, and its Faculty of Medicine conducted the inquiry, which was given in favour of the Abbey, on the ground that what looked like a charm might be of the nature of a medical regimen.

However, though the sacristan was the medium of the cure, the general care of the patients was left to externs. The hospital was served by secular priests, since the monks heard no confessions save those of their own people. This rule they observed,

in order to reserve themselves to the proper duties of a Benedictine,—the choir, study, manual labour, and transcription of books; and, while the Maurists were ocular witnesses of their agricultural toils, they saw the diligence of their penmanship in its results, for the MSS. of their Library were the choicest in the country. Among them, they tell us, were copies of St. Jerome's Bible, the Acts of the Councils, Bede's History, Gregory and Isidore, Origen and Augustine.

The Maurists report as favourably of the monastic buildings themselves as of the hospital and library. Those buildings were a chronicle of past times, and of the changes which had taken place in them. First there were the poor huts of St. Bregise upon the half-cleared and still marshy ground of the forest; then came the rebuilding, when St. Hubert was brought there; and centuries after that, St. Thierry, the intimate friend of the great Pope Hildebrand, had renewed it magnificently, at the time that he was Abbot. He was sadly treated in his lifetime by his monks, as Nicholas after him; but, after his death, they found out that he was a Saint, which they might have discovered before it; and they placed him in the crypt, and there he and another holy Abbot after him lay in peace, till the Calvinists broke into it in the sixteenth century, and burned both of them to ashes. There were marks too of the same fanatics on the pillars of the nave of the church; which had been built by Abbot John de Wahart in the twelfth century, and then again from its foundations by Abbots Nicholas de Malaise and Romaclus, the friend of Blossius, four centuries later; and it was ornamented by Abbot Cyprian, who was called the friend of the poor; and doubtless the travellers admired the marble of the choir and sanctuary, and the silver candelabra of the altar given by the reigning Lord Abbot; and perhaps they heard him sing solemn Mass on the Assumption, as was usual on that feast, with his four secular chaplains, one to carry his Cross, another his mitre, a third his gremial, and a fourth his candle, and accompanied by the pealing organ and the many clattering bells, which had been the gift of Abbot Balla about a hundred years earlier. Can we imagine a more graceful union of human

with divine, of the sweet with the austere, of business and of calm, of splendour and of simplicity, than is displayed in a great religious house after this pattern, when unrelaxed in its observance, and pursuing the ends for which it was endowed?

The monks had been accused of choosing beautiful spots for their dwellings; as if this were a luxury in ascetics, and not rather the necessary alleviation of their penances. Even when their critics are kindest, they consider such sites as chosen by a sort of sentimental, ornamental indolence. "Beaulieu river," says Mr. Warner in his topography of Hampshire, and, as he writes far less ill-naturedly than the run of authors, we will quote him, "Beaulieu river is stocked with plenty of fish, and boasts in particular of good oysters and fine plaice, and is fringed quite to the edge of the water with the most beautiful hanging woods. In the area enclosed are distinct traces of various fish-ponds, formed for the use of the convent. Some of them continue perfect to the present day, and abound with fish. A curious instance occurs also of monkish luxury, even in the article of water; to secure a fine spring those monastics have spared neither trouble nor expense. About half a mile to the south-east of the Abbey is a deep wood; and at a spot almost inaccessible is a cave formed of smooth stones. It has a very contracted entrance, but spreads gradually into a little apartment, of seven feet wide, ten deep, and about five high. This covers a copious and transparent spring of water, which, issuing from the mouth of the cave, is lost in a deep dell, and is there received, as I have been informed, by a chain of small stone pipes, which formerly, when perfect, conveyed it quite to the Abbey. It must be confessed, the monks in general displayed an elegant taste in the choice of their situations. Beaulieu Abbey is a striking proof of this. Perhaps few spots in the kingdom could have been pitched upon, better calculated for monastic seclusion than this. The deep woods, with which it is almost environed, throw an air of gloom and solemnity over the scene, well suited to excite religious emotions; while the stream that glides by its side, afforded to the recluse a striking emblem of human life: and at the same time that it soothed his mind by

a gentle murmuring, led it to serious thought by its continual and irrevocable lesson.”¹

The monks were not so soft as all this, after all; and if Mr. Warner had seen them, we feel sure he would have been astonished at the stern, as well as sweet simplicity which characterised them. They were not dreamy sentimentalists, to fall in love with melancholy winds and purling rills, and waterfalls and nodding groves; but their poetry was the poetry of hard work and hard fare, unselfish hearts and charitable hands. They could plough and reap, they could hedge and ditch, they could drain; they could lop, they could carpenter; they could thatch, they could make hurdles for their huts; they could make a road, they could divert or secure the streamlet’s bed, they could bridge a torrent. Mr. Warner mentions one of their luxuries,—clear, wholesome water; it was an allowable one, especially as they obtained it by their own patient labour. If their grounds are picturesque, if their views are rich, they made them so, and had, we presume, a right to enjoy the work of their own hands. They found a swamp, a moor, a thicket, a rock, and they made an Eden in the wilderness. They destroyed snakes; they extirpated wild cats, wolves, boars, bears; they put to flight or they converted rovers, outlaws, robbers. The gloom of the forest departed, and the sun, for the first time since the Deluge, shone upon the moist ground. St. Benedict is the true man of Ross.

“Who hung with woods yon mountain’s sultry brow?
 From the dry rock who made the waters flow?
 Whose causeway parts the vale with shady rows?
 Whose seats the weary traveller repose?
 He feeds yon almshouse, neat, but void of state,
 When Age and Want sit smiling at the gate;
 Him portioned maids, apprenticed orphans blessed,
 The young who labour, and the old who rest.”

And candid writers, though not Catholics, allow it. Even English, and much more foreign historians and antiquarians, have arrived at a unanimous verdict here. “We owe the agri-

¹ Vol. i. p. 237, etc.

cultural restoration of great part of Europe to the monks," says Mr. Hallam. "The monks were much the best husbandmen, and the only gardeners," says Forsyth. "None," says Wharton, "ever improved their lands and possessions more than the monks, by building, cultivating, and other methods." The cultivation of Church lands, as Sharon Turner infers from Domesday Book, was superior to that held by other proprietors, for there was less wood upon them, less common pasture, and more abundant meadow. "Wherever they came," says Mr. Soame on Mosheim, "they converted the wilderness into a cultivated country; they pursued the breeding of cattle and agriculture, laboured with their own hands, drained morasses, and cleared away forests. By them Germany was rendered a fruitful country." M. Guizot speaks as strongly: "The Benedictine monks were the agriculturists of Europe; they cleared it on a large scale, associating agriculture with preaching."¹

St. Benedict's direct object in setting his monks to manual labour, was neither social usefulness nor poetry, but penance; still his work was both the one and the other. The above-cited authors enlarge upon its use, and we may be allowed to dwell upon its poetry; we may contemplate both its utility to man and its service to God in the aspect of its poetry. How romantic then, as well as useful, how lively as well as serious, is their history, with its episodes of personal adventure and prowess, its pictures of squatter, hunter, farmer, civil engineer, and evangelist united in the same individual, its supernatural colouring of heroic virtue and miracle! When St. Columban first came into Burgundy with his twelve young monks, he placed himself in a vast wilderness, and made them set about cultivating the soil. At first they all suffered from hunger, and were compelled to live on the barks of trees and wild herbs. On one occasion they were for five days in this condition. St. Gall, one of them, betook himself to a Swiss forest, fearful from the multitude of wild beasts; and then, choosing the neighbourhood of a moun-

¹ Hallam, *Middle Ag.*, vol. iii. p. 436. Forsyth, *Antiqu.*, vol. i. pp. 37, 44, 179. Turner, *Anglo-Sax.*, vol. ii. p. 167. Murdoch's *Mosheim*, vol. ii. p. 21, etc. Guizot, *Hist. Civil.*, vol. ii. p. 75, Bohn.

tain stream, he made a cross of twigs, and hung some relics on it, and laid the foundation of his celebrated abbey. St. Ronan came from Ireland to Cornwall, and chose a wood, full of wild beasts, for his hermitage, near the Lizard. The monks of St. Dubritius, the founder of the Welsh Schools, also sought the woods, and there they worked hard at manufactures, agriculture, and road-making. St. Sequanus placed himself where "the trees almost touched the clouds." He and his companions, when they first explored it, asked themselves how they could penetrate into it, when they saw a winding footpath, so narrow and full of briars, that it was with difficulty that one foot followed another. With much labour and with torn clothes they succeeded in gaining its depths, and stooping their heads into the darkness at their feet, they perceived a cavern, shrouded by the thick interlacing branches of the trees, and blocked up with stones and underwood. "This," says the monastic account, "was the cavern of robbers, and the resort of evil spirits." Sequanus fell on his knees, prayed, made the sign of the Cross over the abyss, and built his cell there. Such was the first foundation of the celebrated abbey called after him in Burgundy.¹

Sturm, the Bavarian convert of St. Boniface, was seized with a desire, as his master had been in his English monastery, of founding a religious house in the wilds of pagan Germany; and setting out with two companions, he wandered for two days through the Buchonian forest, and saw nothing but earth, sky, and large trees. On the third day he stopped and chose a spot, which on trial did not answer. Then, mounting an ass, he set out by himself, cutting down branches of a night to secure himself from the wild beasts, till at length he came to the place (described by St. Boniface as "*locum silvaticum in eremo, vastissimæ solitudinis*"), in which afterwards arose the abbey and schools of Fulda. Wunibald was suspicious of the good wine of the Rhine where he was, and, determining to leave it,

¹ Neander, *Memorials*, pp. 436, 451, 473, Bohn. Rader, *Favaria Sacra. Calles Ann. Germ.*, t. i. pp. 200, 276, 317, 318. Guizot, *Civil.*, vol. ii. p. 134. Whitaker's *Cornwall*, vol. ii. p. 196. Fosbroke, *Antiq.*, p. 16.

he bought the land where Heidensheim afterwards stood, then a wilderness of trees and underwood, covering a deep valley and the sides of lofty mountains. There he proceeded, axe in hand, to clear the ground for his religious house, while the savage natives looked on sullenly, jealous for their hunting grounds and sacred trees. Willibald, his brother, had pursued a similar work on system; he had penetrated his forest in every direction and scattered monasteries over it. The Irish Alto pitched himself in a wood, half way between Munich and Vienna. Pirminius chose an island, notorious for its snakes, and there he planted his hermitage and chapel, which at length became the rich and noble abbey and school of Augia Major or Richenau.¹

The more celebrated School of Bec had a similar beginning at a later date, when Herluin, an old soldier, devoted his house and farm to an ecclesiastical purpose, and governed, as abbot, the monastery which he had founded. "You might see him," says the writer of his life, "when office was over in church, going out to his fields, at the head of his monks, with his bag of seed about his neck, and his rake or hoe in his hand. There he remained with them hard at work till the day was closing. Some were employed in clearing the land of brambles and weeds; others spread manure; others were weeding or sowing; no one ate his bread in idleness. Then when the hour came for saying office in church, they all assembled together punctually. Their ordinary food was bread of bran,² and vegetables with salt and water; and the water muddy, for the well was two miles off."³ Lanfranc, then a secular, was so overcome by the simple Abbot, fresh from the field, setting about his baking with dirty hands, that he forthwith became one of the party;⁴ and being unfitted for labour, opened in the house a school of logic, thereby to make money for the community. Such was

¹ Meyrick's *Willibald*, p. 68. *Bavaria Sacra*, p. 119. Petri, *Suevia Eccles.*, p. 96. *Calles Ann. Germ.*, t. i. p. 191.

² Siligineus—i.e., *wheaten*; but can it be quasi ex siliqua, not, ex siligine? *vide* Hor. *Ep.*, lib. 2, 123.

³ Butler's *Lives*, Aug. 20.

⁴ *Apud Mabillon Act. Bened.*

the cradle of the scholastic theology; the last years of the patristic, which were nearly contemporaneous, exhibit a similar scene:—St. Bernard founding his abbey of Clairvaux in a place called the Valley of Wormwood, in the heart of a savage forest, the haunt of robbers, and his thirteen companions grubbing up a homestead, raising a few huts, and living on barley or cockle bread with boiled beech leaves for vegetables.¹

How beautiful is Simeon of Durham's account of Easterwine, the first abbot after Bennet of St. Peter's at Wearmouth! He was a man of noble birth, who gave himself to religion, and died young. "Though he had been in the service of King Egfrid," says Simeon, "when he had once left secular affairs, and laid aside his arms, and taken on him the spiritual warfare instead, he was nothing but the humble monk, just like any of his brethren, winnowing with them with great joy, milking the ewes and cows, and in the bakehouse, the garden, the kitchen, and all house duties, cheerful and obedient. And, when he received the name of Abbot, still he was in spirit just what he was before to every one, gentle, affable, and kind; or, if any fault had been committed, correcting it indeed by the Rule, but still so winning the offender by his unaffected earnest manner, that he had no wish ever to repeat the offence, or to dim the brightness of that most clear countenance with the cloud of his transgression. And often going here and there on business of the monastery, when he found his brothers at work, he would at once take part in it, guiding the plough, or shaping the iron, or taking the winnowing fan, or the like. He was young and strong, with a sweet voice, a cheerful temper, a liberal heart, and a handsome countenance. He partook of the same food as his brethren, and under the same roof. He slept in the common dormitory, as before he was abbot, and he continued to do so for the first two days of his illness, when death had now seized him, as he knew full well. But for the last five days he betook himself to a more retired dwelling; and then, coming out into the open air and sitting down, and calling for all his brethren, after the manner of his tender nature, he gave his weeping

¹ Thomass., *Disc. Eccl.*, t. iii. p. 513.

monks the kiss of peace, and died at night while they were singing lauds.”¹

This gentleness and tenderness of heart seems to have been as characteristic of the monks as their simplicity; and if there are some Saints among them who on the public stage of history do not show it, it was because they were called out of their convents for some special purpose. Bede goes out of his way to observe of Ethelbert, on St. Austin's converting him, that “he had learned from the teachers and authors of his salvation, that men were to be drawn heavenwards, and not forced.” Aldhelm, when a council had been held about the perverse opinions of the British Christians, seconding the principle which the Fathers of it laid down, that “schismatics were to be convinced, not compelled,” wrote a book upon their error and converted many of them. Wolstan, when the civil power failed in its attempts to stop the slave-trade of the Bristol people, succeeded by his persevering preaching. In the confessional he was so gentle, that penitents came to him from all parts of England.² This has been the spirit of the monks from the first. The student of ecclesiastical history may recollect a certain passage in St. Martin's history, when his desire to shield the Spanish heretics from death brought him into difficulties, from which he hardly escaped, in his mode of dealing with the usurper Maximus.

Penance indeed and mercy have gone hand in hand in the history of the monks; from the Solitaries in Egypt down to the Trappists of this day, it is one of the points in which the unity of the monastic idea shows itself. They have ever toiled for others, while they toiled for themselves; nor for posterity only, but for their poor neighbours, and for travellers who came to them. St. Augustine tells us, that the monks of Egypt and of the East made so much by manual labour as to be able to freight vessels with provisions for impoverished districts. Theodoret speaks of a certain five thousand of them, who by their labour supported, besides themselves, innumerable poor

¹ P. 93. The passage seems taken from Bede.

² Bede, *Hist. Eccles.*, i. 26, William of Malmesb., *Ponfic. Angl.*

and strangers. Sozomen speaks of the monk Zeno, who, though a hundred years old, and the bishop of a rich Church, worked for the poor as well as for himself. Corbinian in a subsequent century surrounded his German Church with fruit trees and vines, and sustained the poor with the produce. The monks of St. Gall, already mentioned, gardened, planted, fished, and thus secured the means of relieving the poor and entertaining strangers. "Monasteries," says Neander, "were seats for the promotion of various trades, arts, and sciences. The gains accruing from their combined labour were employed for the relief of the distressed. In great famines, thousands were rescued from starvation."¹ In a scarcity at the beginning of the twelfth century, a monastery in the neighbourhood of Cologne distributed in one day fifteen hundred alms, consisting of bread, meat, and vegetables. About the same time, St. Bernard founded his monastery of Citeaux, which, though situated in the waste district described above, was able at length to sustain two thousand poor for months, besides extraordinary alms bestowed on others. The monks offered their simple hospitality, uninviting as it might be, to high as well as low; and to those who scorned their fare, they at least could offer a refuge in misfortune or danger, or after casualties.

Duke William, ancestor of the Conqueror, was hunting in the woods about Jumieges, when he fell in with a rude hermitage.² Two monks had made their way through the forest, and with immense labour had rooted up some trees, levelled the ground, raised some crops, and put together their hut. William heard their story, not perhaps in the best humour, and flung aside in contempt the barley bread and water which they offered him. Presently he was brought back wounded and insensible: he had got the worst in an encounter with a boar. On coming to himself, he accepted the hospitality which he had refused at first, and built for them a monastery. Doubtless he had looked on them as trespassers or squatters on his domain,

¹ *Eccl. Hist.*, vol. vii. p. 331, Bohn.

² Duchesne, *Script. North.*, p. 236.

though with a religious character and object. The Norman princes were as good friends to the wild beasts as the monks were enemies : a charter still exists of the Conqueror granted to the abbey of Caen,¹ in which he stipulates that its inmates should not turn the woods into tillage, and reserves the game for himself.

Contrast with this savage retreat and its rude hospitality, the different, though equally Benedictine picture of the sacred grove of Subiaco, and the spiritual entertainment which it ministers to all comers, as given in the late pilgrimage of Bishop Ullathorne : "The trees," he says, "which form the venerable grove, are very old, but their old age is vigorous and healthy. Their great gray roots expose themselves to view with all manner of curling lines and wrinkles on them, and the rough stems bend and twine about with the vigour and ease of gigantic pythons. . . . Of how many holy solitaries have these trees witnessed the meditations ! And then they have seen beneath their quiet boughs the irruption of mailed men, tormented by the thirst of plunder and the passion of blood, which even a sanctuary held so sacred could not stay. And then they have witnessed, for twelve centuries and more, the greatest of the Popes, the Gregories, the Leos, the Innocents, and the Piuses, coming one after another to refresh themselves from their labours in a solitude which is steeped with the inspirations and redolent with the holiness of St. Benedict."²

What congenial subjects for his verse would the sweetest of all poets have found in scenes and histories such as the foregoing, he who in his Georgics has shown such love of a country life and country occupations, and of the themes and trains of thought which rise out of the country ! Would that Christianity had a Virgil to describe the old monks at their rural labours, as it has had a Sacchi or a Domenichino to paint them ! How would he have been able to set forth the adventures and the hardships of the missionary husbandmen, who sang of the Scythian winter, and the murrain of the cattle, the stag of Sylvia, and the forest home of Evander ! How could he have

¹ Turner, *Middle Ag.*, vol. v. p. 89.

² P. 37.

portrayed St. Paulinus or St. Serenus in his garden, who could draw so beautiful a picture of the old Corycian, raising amid the thicket his scanty potherbs upon the nook of land, which was "not good for tillage, nor for pasture, nor for vines"! How could he have brought out the poetry of those simple labourers, who has told us of that old man's flowers and fruits, and of the satisfaction, as a king's, which he felt in those innocent riches! He who had so huge a dislike of cities, and great houses, and high society, and sumptuous banquets, and the canvass for office, and the hard law, and the noisy lawyer, and the statesman's harangue,—he who thought the country proprietor as even too blessed, did he but know his blessedness, and who loved the valley, winding stream, and wood, and the hidden life which they offer, and the deep lessons which they whisper,—how could he have illustrated that wonderful union of prayer, penance, toil, and literary work, the true "*otium cum dignitate*," a fruitful leisure and a meek-hearted dignity, which is exemplified in the Benedictine! That ethereal fire which enabled the prince of Latin poets to take up the Sibyl's strain, and to adumbrate the glories of a supernatural future, that serene philosophy, which has strewn his poems with sentiments which come home to the heart, that intimate sympathy with the sorrows of human kind and with the action and passion of human nature, how well would they have served to illustrate the patriarchal history and office of the monks in the broad German countries, or the deeds, the words, and the visions of a St. Odilo or a St. Aelred!

What a poet deliberately chooses for the subject of his poems, must be in its own nature poetical. A poet indeed is but a man after all, and in his proper person may prefer solid beef and pudding to all the creations of his own "*fine frenzy*," which, in his character of poet, are his meat and drink. But no poet will ever commit his poetical reputation to the treatment of subjects which do not admit of poetry. When, then, Virgil chooses the country and rejects the town, he shows us that a certain aspect of the town is uncongenial with poetry, and that a certain aspect of the country is congenial. Repose,

intellectual and moral, is that quality of country life which he selects for his praises ; and effort, and bustle, and excitement is that quality of town life which he abhors. Herein then, according to Virgil, lies the poetry of St. Benedict, in the "*securus quies et nescia fallere vita*," in the absence of anxiety and fretfulness, of schemes and scheming, of hopes and fears, of doubts and disappointments. Such a life,—living for the day without solicitude for the morrow, without plans or objects, even holy ones, here below ; working, not (so to say) by the piece, but as hired by the hour ; sowing the ground with the certainty, according to the promise, of reaping ; reading or writing this present week without the consequent necessity of reading or writing during the next ; dwelling among one's own people without distant ties ; taking each new day as a whole in itself, an addition, not a complement, to the past ; and doing works which cannot be cut short, for they are complete in every portion of them,—such a life may be called emphatically Virgilian. They, on the contrary, whose duty lies in what may be called *undertakings*, in science and system, in sustained efforts of the intellect or elaborate processes of action,—apologists, controversialists, disputants in the schools, professors in the chair, teachers in the pulpit, rulers in the Church,—have a noble and meritorious mission, but not so poetical a one. When the bodily frame receives an injury, or is seized with some sudden malady, nature may be expected to set right the evil, if left to itself, but she requires time ; science comes in to shorten the process, and is violent that it may be certain. This may be taken to illustrate St. Benedict's mode of counteracting the miseries of life. He found the world, physical and social, in ruins, and his mission was to restore it in the way, not of science, but of nature, not as if setting about to do it, not professing to do it by any set time or by any rare specific or by any series of strokes, but so quietly, patiently, gradually, that often, till the work was done, it was not known to be doing. It was a restoration, rather than a visitation, correction, or conversion. The new world which he helped to create was a growth rather than a structure. Silent men were observed about the

country, or discovered in the forest, digging, clearing, and building ; and other silent men, not seen were sitting in the cold cloister, tiring their eyes, and keeping their attention on the stretch, while they painfully deciphered and copied and re-copied the manuscripts which they had saved. There was no one that "contended, or cried out," or drew attention to what was going on ; but by degrees the woody swamp became a hermitage, a religious house, a farm, an abbey, a village, a seminary, a school of learning, and a city. Roads and bridges connected it with other abbeys and cities, which had similarly grown up; and what the haughty Alaric or fierce Attila had broken to pieces, these patient meditative men had brought together and made to live again.

And then, when they had in the course of many years gained their peaceful victories, perhaps some new invader came, and with fire and sword undid their slow and persevering toil in an hour. The Hun succeeded to the Goth, the Lombard to the Hun, the Tartar to the Lombard ; the Saxon was reclaimed only that the Dane might take his place. Down in the dust lay the labour and civilisation of centuries,—Churches, Colleges, Cloisters, Libraries,—and nothing was left to them but to begin over again ; but this they did without grudging, so promptly, cheerfully, and tranquilly, as if it were by some law of nature that the restoration came, and they were like the flowers and shrubs and fruit trees which they reared, and which, when ill-treated, do not take vengeance, or remember evil, but give forth fresh branches, leaves, or blossoms, perhaps in greater profusion, or with richer quality, for the very reason that the old were rudely broken off. If one holy place was desecrated, the monks pitched upon another, and by this time there were rich or powerful men who remembered and loved the past enough, to wish to have it restored in the future. Thus was it in the case of the monastery of Ramsey after the ravages of the Danes. A wealthy Earl, whose heart was touched, consulted his Bishop how he could best promote the divine glory: the Bishop answered that they only were free, serene, and unsolicitous, who renounced the world, and that their renunciation

brought a blessing on their country. "By their merit," he said, "the anger of the Supreme Judge is abated; a healthier atmosphere is granted; corn springs up more abundantly; famine and pestilence withdraw; the state is better governed; prisons are opened; the fetters unbound; the shipwrecked relieved." He proceeded to advise him as to the best of courses, to give ground for a monastery, and to build and endow it. Earl Alwin observed in reply, that he had inherited some waste land in the midst of marshes, with a forest in the neighbourhood, some open spots of good turf, and others of meadow; and he took the Bishop to see it. It was in fact an island in the fens, and as lonely as religious men could desire. The gift was accepted, workmen were collected, the pious peasants round about gave their labour. Twelve monks were found from another cloister; cells and a chapel were soon raised. Materials were collected for a handsome church; stones and cement were given; a firm foundation was secured; scaffolding and machinery were lent; and in course of time a sacred edifice and two towers rose over the desolate waste, and renewed the past;—a learned divine from France was invited to preside over the monastic school.¹

Here then we are led lastly to speak of the literary labours of the Benedictines, but we have not room to do more than direct attention to the peculiar character of their work, and must pass over their schools altogether. Here, as in other respects above noticed, the unity of monachism shows itself. What the Benedictines have been, even in their latest literary developments, in St. Maur in the seventeenth century, and at Solesme now, such were the monks in their first years. One of the chief occupations of the disciples of St. Pachomius in Egypt was the transcription of books. It was the sole labour of the monks of St. Martin in Gaul. The Syrian solitaries, according to St. Chrysostom, employed themselves in making copies of the Holy Scriptures. It was the occupation of the monks of St. Equitius and of Cassiodorus, and of the nunnery of St. Cæsarius. We read of one holy man preparing the skins for writing, of another selling his manuscripts in order to gain alms for the

¹ *Vide* Turner, *Anglo-Saxons*, vol. iii. p. 468.

poor, and of an abbess writing St. Peter's Epistles in letters of gold. St. David had shown the same reverence to St. John's Gospel. Abbot Plato filled his own and other monasteries with his beautifully written volumes.¹ During the short rule of Abbot Desiderius at Monte Cassino, his monks wrote out St. Austin's fifty Homilies, his Letters, his Comment upon the Sermon on the Mount, upon St. Paul and upon Genesis; parts of St. Jerome and St. Ambrose, part of St. Bede, St. Leo's Sermons, the Orations of St. Gregory Nazianzen; the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles and the Apocalypse; various histories, including that of St. Gregory of Tours, Josephus on the Jewish War, Justinian's Institutes, and many ascetic and other works; of the Classics, Cicero de Natura Deorum, Terence, Ovid's *Fasti*, Horace, and Virgil. Maurus Lapi, a Camaldolese, in the fifteenth century, copied a thousand volumes in less than fifty years. Jerome, a monk in an Austrian monastery, wrote so great a number of books, that, it is said, a waggon with six horses would scarcely suffice to draw them. Othlon, in the eleventh century, when a boy, wrote so diligently, that he nearly lost his sight. That was in France; he then went to Ratisbon, where he wrote nineteen missals, three books of the Gospel, two books of Epistle and Gospel, and many others. Many he gave to his friends, but the list is too long to finish. The Abbot Odo of Tournay "used to exult," according to his successor, "in the number of writers which the Lord had given him. Had you gone into his cloister, you might have seen a dozen young men sitting in perfect silence, writing at tables, constructed for the purpose. All Jerome's Commentaries on the Prophets, all the works of St. Gregory, all that he could find of Austin, Ambrose, Isidore, Bede, and the Lord Anselm, Abbot of Bec, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, he caused to be diligently transcribed."²

¹ *Pallad*, c. 39. *Cassian, Inst.*, iv. 12. *Calmet, Reg.*, t. ii. p. 150. *Thomass., Disc. Eccles.*, t. iii. p. 505. *Ziegelbauer, Hist. Litt. Bened.*, t. ii. p. 510.

² *Annal. Camald.*, t. vii. p. 300: *vide* other instances in Maitland's *Dark Ages*, and Buckingham's *Bible in the Middle Ages*, who is deficient in references.

These tranquil labourers found a further field in the illumination and binding of the transcribed volumes, as they had previously been occupied in the practice necessary for the then important art of caligraphy. It was not running hand that the monks had to learn; for it was no ephemeral expression of their own thoughts which their writing was to convey, but the formal transcript, for the benefit of posterity, of the words of inspired teachers and Doctors of the Church. They were performing what has been since the printer's work; and it is said that from the English monks is derived the small letter of the modern Roman type. In France the abbeys of Fontenelle, Rheims, and Corbie were especially famed for beauty of penmanship in the age of Charlemagne,¹ when literature was in its most depressed state. Books intended for presents, such as that which the mother of Leo the Ninth presented to St. Hubert, and, much more, if intended for sacred uses, were enriched with gold and silver plates and precious stones. Here was a commencement of the cultivation of the fine arts in those turbulent times,—a quiet, unexciting occupation, which went on inside the monasteries, whatever rivalries or heresies agitated Christendom outside of them, and which, though involving, of course, an improvement in the workmanship as time went on, yet in the case of every successive specimen, whatever exact degree of skill or taste each exhibited, had its end in itself, as though there had been no other specimen before or after.

Brower, in his work on the *Antiquities of Fulda*, gives us a lively picture of the various tranquil occupations, which were going on at one time within the monastic walls. "As industrious bees," he says, "their work never flagging, did these monks follow out their calling. Some of them were engaged in describing, here and there upon the parchment, the special letters and characters which were to be filled in; others were wrapping or binding the manuscripts in handsome covers; others were marking out in red the remarkable sentences or the heads of the chapters. Some were writing fairly what had been thrown together at random, or had been left out in the

¹ Guizot's *Hist. Civil.*, vol. ii. p. 236, Bohn.

dictation, and were putting every part in fair order. And not a few of them excelled in painting in all manner of colours, and in drawing figures.”¹ He goes on to refer to an old manuscript there which speaks of the monks as decorating their church, and of their carpenters’ work, sculpture, engraving, and brass work.

We have mentioned St. Dunstan in an earlier page as called to political duties, which were out of keeping with the traditional spirit of his Order; here, however, he shows himself in the simple character of a Benedictine. He had a taste for the arts generally, especially music. He painted and embroidered; his skill in smith’s work is recorded in the well-known legend of his combat with the evil one. And, as the monks of Hilarion joined gardening with psalmody, and Bernard and his Cistercians joined field work with meditation, so did St. Dunstan use music and painting as directly expressive or suggestive of devotion. “He excelled in writing, painting, moulding in wax, carving in wood and bone, and in work in gold, silver, iron, and brass,” says the writer of his life in Surius. “And he used his skill in musical instruments, to charm away himself and others from secular annoyances, and to rouse them to the thought of heavenly harmony, both by the sweet words with which he accompanied his airs, and by the concord of those airs themselves.”² And then he goes on to mention, how on one occasion, when he had hung his harp against the wall, and the wind brought out from its strings a wild melody, he recognised in it one of the antiphons in the Commune Martyrum, “Gaudete in Cœlis,” etc., and used it for his own humiliation.

As might be expected, the monasteries of the South of Europe would not be behind the North in accomplishments of this kind. Those of St. Gall, Monte Cassino, and Solignac are especially spoken of as skilled in the fine arts. Monte Cassino excelled in *miniatura* and mosaic, the Camaldolese in painting, and the Olivetans in wood-inlaying.³

¹ P. 45.

² *Vide* also Whitaker’s *Cornwall*, vol. i. p. 167, and the whole chapter.

³ Meehan’s *Marchese*, p. xxiv.

While manual labour, applied to these artistic purposes, ministered to devotion, on the other hand, when applied to the transcription and multiplication of books, it was a method of instruction, and that peculiarly Benedictine, as being of a literary, not a scientific nature. Systematic theology had but a limited place in ecclesiastical study prior to the eleventh and twelfth centuries; Scripture and the Fathers were the received means of education, and these constituted the very text on which the pens of the monks were employed. And thus they would be becoming familiar with that kind of knowledge which was proper to their vocation, at the same time that they were engaged in what was unequivocally a manual labour; and in providing for the religious necessities of posterity, they were directly serving their own edification. And this again had been the practice of the monks from the first, and is included in the *unity* of their profession. St. Chrysostom tells us that their ordinary occupation in his time was "to sing and pray, to read Scripture, and to transcribe the sacred text."¹ As the writings of the Fathers gradually became the literary property of the Church, these, too, became the subject-matter of the reading and the writing of the monks. "For him who is going on to perfection," says St. Benedict in his Rule, "there are the lessons of the Holy Fathers, which lead to its very summit. For what page, what passage of the Old or New Testament, coming as it does with divine authority, is not the very exactest rule of life? What book of the Holy Catholic Fathers does not resound with this one theme, how we may take the shortest course to our Creator?" But we need not here insist on this characteristic of monastic study, which, especially as regards the study of Scripture, has been treated so fully and so well by Mr. Maitland in his *Essays on the Dark Ages*.

The sacred literature of the monks went a step farther. They would be naturally led by their continual perusal of the Scriptures and the Fathers, to attempt to compare and adjust these two chief sources of theological truth with each other. Hence

¹ *Hist. Liter. de St. Maur*, 1770, p. 21.

resulted the peculiar character of the religious works of what may be especially called the Benedictine period, the five centuries between St. Gregory and St. Anselm. The age of the fathers was well nigh over; the age of the schoolmen was yet to come; the ecclesiastical writers of the intervening period employed themselves for the most part in arranging and digesting the patristical literature which had come down to them; they either strung together choice passages of the Fathers in *catenæ*, as a running illustration of the inspired text, or they formed them into a comment upon it. The *Summæ Sententiarum* of the same period were works of a similar character, while they also opened the way to the intellectual exercises of the scholastic period; for they were lessons or instructions arranged according to a scheme or system of doctrine, though they were still extracted from the works of the Fathers, and though the matter of those works suggested the divisions or details of the system. Moreover, such labours, as much as transcription itself, were Benedictine in their spirit, as well as in their subject-matter; for where there was nothing of original research, nothing of brilliant or imposing result, there would be nothing to dissipate, elate, or absorb the mind, or to violate the simplicity and tranquillity proper to the monastic state.

The same remark applies to a further literary employment in which the Benedictines allowed themselves, and which is the last we shall here mention, and that is the compilation of chronicles and annals, whether ecclesiastical, secular, or monastic. So prominent a place does this take in their literature, that the author of the *Asceticon*, in the fourth volume of Dom François's "Bibliothèque des Écrivains Bénédictins," does not hesitate to point to the historical writings of his Order as constituting one of its chief claims, after its Biblical works, on the gratitude of posterity. "This," he says, "is the praise especially due to the monks, that they have illustrated Holy Scripture, rescued history, sacred and profane, from the barbarism of the times, and have handed down to posterity so many lives both of Saints and of

Bishops.”¹ Here again is a fresh illustration of the Benedictine character; for first, those histories are of the most simple structure and most artless composition, and next, from the circumstance of their being commonly narratives of contemporary events, or compilations from a few definite sources of information which were at hand, they involved nothing of that laborious research and excitement of mind which is demanded of the writer who has to record a complex course of history, extending over many centuries and countries, and who aims at the discovery of truth, in the midst of deficient, redundant, or conflicting testimony. “The men who wrote history,” says Mr. Dowling, speaking of the times in question, “did not write by rule; they only put down what they had seen, what they had heard, what they knew. Very many of them did what they did as a matter of moral duty. The result was something *sui generis*; it was not even what *we* call history at all. It was, if I may so speak, something more, an actual admeasurement rather than a picture; or, if a picture, it was painted in a style which had all the minute accuracy and homely reality of the most domestic of the Flemish masters, not the lofty hyperbole of the Roman school, nor the obtrusive splendour, not less unnatural, of the Venetian. In a word, history, as a subject of criticism, is an art, a noble and beautiful *art*; the historical writings of the middle ages is *nature*.”²

Allusion is made in this passage to the peculiarity in monastic historiography, that it proceeded from the motive of religious obedience. This must always have been the case from the monastic profession; however, we have here, in addition to the presumption, actual evidence, and not on one occasion only, of the importance which the Benedictine Order attached to these notices and memorials of past times. In the year 1082, for instance, the Abbot Marquand of New Corbie in Saxony seems to have sent an order to all churches and monasteries subject to his rule, to send to him severally the chronicles of their own

¹ P. 379. Printing, another tranquil work, was introduced into Italy by the Benedictines of Subiaco. *Vide* Dr. Ullathorne's *Pilgrimage*.

² *Introduct.*, *Eccles. Hist.*, p. 56.

places. Abbot Wichbold repeated the order sixty years later, and Abbot Thierry in 1337 addressed to the provosts and rectors subject to him, a like injunction.¹ Again, in 1481 the Abbot of Erfurdt addressed a letter to the Fathers of the Reform of Bursfeld, with the view of persuading them to enter into a similar undertaking. "If you were to agree among yourselves," he says, "and make a statute to the effect that every Prelate is under an obligation to compose annals and histories of his monastery, what could be better, what more useful, what more interesting, whether for knowing or for reading?"²

It is easier to conjecture what those literary works would be, in which a Benedictine would find himself at liberty to engage, than to pretend to point out those from which his vocation would debar him; yet Mabillon, equally with De Rancé, implied that all subjects do not come alike to him. Here we are recalled to the well-known controversy between these two celebrated men. The Abbot of La Trappe, the Cistercian De Rancé, writing to his own people, put forth some statements on the subject of the studies proper to a monk, which seemed to reflect upon the learned Maurists. Mabillon, one of them, replied, in a learned vindication of himself and his brethren. The Abbot had maintained that study of whatever kind should be kept in strict subordination to manual labour, and should not extend to any books except the Scriptures and the ascetic treatises of the Fathers. Mabillon, on the other hand, without denying the necessity of manual labour, to which the Maurists themselves devoted an hour a day, seemed to allow to the Benedictine the free cultivation of the intellect, and an unlimited range of studies. When they explained themselves, each combatant would appear to have asserted more than he could successfully maintain; yet after all there was a considerable difference of view between them, which could not be

¹ Ziegelbauer, t. ii. p. 401.

² *Ibid.*, t. i. p. 424. For lists of monastic histories, *vide* Mr. Dowling, as above, p. 260; the *Asceticon*, as above, § 26. Ziegelbauer, t. ii. p. 398. Balmez, *Prot. and Cath.*, p. 195.

removed. The critical question was, whether certain historical instances, which Mabillon urged in his favour, were to be considered exceptions or not to the rule of St. Benedict. For ourselves, we have certainly maintained in an earlier page of this article, that such instances as Alcuin, Paschasius, or Lanfranc are no fair specimens of the Benedictine profession, and must not be taken to represent the monks generally. Lest, however, in saying this, we may be thought to be evading the testimony of history, as adduced by a writer, authoritative at once by his learning and as spokesman of the great Congregation of St. Maur, we think it well to extract in our behalf some of his own admissions, which seem to us fully to bear out what we were laying down above about the spirit and mission of his Order.

For instance, he frankly concedes, or rather maintains, that the scholastic method of teaching theology and philosophy is foreign to the profession of a Benedictine, as such. "Why," he asks, "need we cultivate these sciences in the way of disputation? Why not as positive sciences, explaining questions and resolving doubts, as they occur? Why is it not more than enough for religious pupils to be instructed in the more necessary principles of the science, and thereby to make progress in the study of the Scriptures and the Fathers? What need of this perpetual syllogising in form, and sharp answers to innumerable objections, as is the custom in the schools?" Elsewhere, he contrasts the mode of teaching a subject, as adopted by the early Fathers, with that which the schoolmen introduced. "The reasonings of the Fathers," he says, "are so full, so elegantly set forth, as to be everywhere redolent of the sweetness and vigour of Christian eloquence, whereas scholastic theology is absolutely dry and sterile." Elsewhere he says, that "in the study of Holy Scripture consists the entire science of monks." Again, he says of Moral Theology, "As monks are rarely destined to the cure of souls, it does not seem necessary that they should give much time to the science of Morals." And, though of course he does not forbid them the study of history, which we have seen to be so congenial to their calling, yet he

observes of this study when pursued to its full extent, "It seems to cause much dissipation of mind, which is prejudicial to that inward compunction of heart, which is so especially fitted to the holy life of a monk." Again, observing that the examination of ancient MSS. was the special occupation of the Maurists in his time, he says, "They who give themselves to this study have the more merit with God, in that they have so little praise with men. Moreover, it obliges them to devote the more time to solitude, which ought to be their chief delight. I confess it is a most irksome and unpleasant labour; however, it gives much less trouble than transcription, which was the most useful work of our early monks." Elsewhere, speaking of the celebrated Maurist editions of the Fathers, he observes, "Labour, such as this, which is undergone in silence and in quietness, is especially compatible with true tranquillity of mind, and the mastery of the passions, provided we labour as a duty, and not for glory."¹

We trust the reader will be so good as to keep in mind that we are all along speaking of the Benedictine life *historically*, and as we might speak of any other historical *fact*; not venturing at all on what would be the extreme presumption of any quasi-doctrinal or magisterial exposition of it, which belongs to those only who have actually imbibed its tradition. This being clearly understood, we think we may interpret Mabillon to mean that (be the range of studies lawful to a monk what it may) still, whatever literary work requires such continuous portions of time as not to admit of being suspended at a moment's notice, whatever is so interesting that other duties seem dull and heavy after it, whatever so exhausts the power of attention as to incapacitate for attention for other subjects, whatever makes the mind gravitate towards the creature, is inconsistent with monastic simplicity. Accordingly, we should expect to find that controversy was uncongenial to the Benedictine, because it excited the mind, and metaphysical investigations, because they fatigued it; and, when we met such instances as St. Paschasius or St. Anselm, we should deal with them as

¹ *Stud. Monast.*, ed. 1732, t. i. pp. 52, 135; t. ii. p. 2; t. i. pp. 145, 147, 191, 64.

they came and as we could. Moreover, we should not look to a Benedictine for any elaborate and systematic work on the history of doctrine, or of heresy, or any course of patristical theology, or any extended ecclesiastical history, or any philosophical disquisitions upon history, as implying a grasp of innumerable details, and the labour of using a mass of phenomena to the elucidation of a theory, or of bringing a range of multifarious reading to bear upon one point; and that, because such efforts of mind require either an energetic memory devoted to matters of time and place, or, instead of the tranquil and plodding study of one book after another, the presence of a large library, and the distraction of a vast number of books handled all at once, not for perusal, but for reference. Perhaps we are open to the charge of refining, in attempting to illustrate the principle which we seem to ourselves to detect in the Benedictine tradition; but the principle itself which we have before us is clear enough, and is expressed in the advice which is given to us by a sacred writer: "The words of the wise are as goads, and nails deeply fastened in; *more than these, my son, require not*: of making many books there is no end, and much study is an affliction of the flesh."

To test the truth of this view of the Benedictine mission, we cannot do better than appeal as a palmary instance to the Congregation of St. Maur, an intellectual school of Benedictines assuredly. Now what, in matter of fact, is the character of its works? It has no Malebranche, no Thomassin, no Morinus; it has no Bellarmine, no Suarez, no Petavius; it has no Tillemont or Fleury,—all of whom were more or less its contemporaries; but it has a Montfaucon, it has a Mabillon, it has a Sainte Marthe, a Coustant, a Sabbatier, a Martene,—men of immense learning and research; it has collators and publishers of MSS. and of inscriptions, editors of the text and of the versions of Holy Scripture, editors and biographers of the Fathers, antiquarians, annalists, paleographers,—with scholarship indeed, and criticism, and theological knowledge, admirable as often as elicited by the particular subject on which they are directly employed, but conspicuously subordinate to it.

If we turn to other contemporary Congregations of St. Benedict we are met by the same phenomenon. Their labours have been of the same laborious, patient, tranquil kind. The first name which occurs to us is that of Augustine Calmet, of the Congregation of St. Vanne. His works are biblical and antiquarian ;—a literal Comment on Scripture with Dissertations, a dictionary of the Bible, a Comment on the Benedictine Rule, a history of Lorraine. We cast our eyes round the library, in which we happen at the moment to be writing ; what Benedictine authors meet them ? There is Ceillier, also of the Congregation of St. Vanne ; Bertholet, of the same Congregation ; Cardinal Aguirre of Salamanca ; Cressy of Douai ; Pez of Mölk on the Danube ; Lumper of St. George in the Hercynian Forest ; Brockie of the Scotch College at Ratisbon ; Reiner of the English Congregation. Their works are of the same complexion,—historical, antiquarian, biographical, patristical,—calling to mind the line of study traditionally pursued by a modern ecclesiastical congregation, the Italian Oratory. We do not speak of Ziegelbauer, François, and other Benedictines who might be added, because they have confined themselves to Benedictine Antiquities, and every order will write about itself.

And so of the Benedictine Literature from first to last. Ziegelbauer, who has just been mentioned, has written four folio volumes on the subject. Now one of them is devoted to a catalogue and an account of Benedictine authors ;—of these, those on Scripture and Positive Theology occupy 110 pages ; those on history, 300 ; those on scholastic theology, 12 ; those on polemics, 12 ; those on moral theology, 6. This surprising contrast may be an exaggeration of the fact, because there is much of repetition and digression in his survey, and his biographical notices vary in length ; but, after all allowances for such accidental unfairness in the list, the result must surely be considered as strikingly confirmatory of the account which we have been giving.

But we must cut short an investigation which, though im-

perfect for the illustration of its subject, is already long for the patience of the reader. All human works are exposed to vicissitude and decay; and that the great Order of which we have been writing should in the lapse of thirteen centuries have furnished no instances of that general law, is the less to be expected, in proportion to the extent of its territory, the independence of its separate houses, and the local varieties of its constitution. To say that peace may engender selfishness, and humility become a cloak for indolence, and a country life may be an epicurean luxury, is only to enunciate the over-true maxim, that every virtue has a vice for its first cousin. *Usus non tollit abusus*; and the circumstance that Benedictine life admits of corruption into a mode of living which is not Benedictine, but its very contradictory, cannot surely be made an argument against its meritorious innocence, its resolute cheerfulness, and its strenuous tranquillity. We are told to be like little children; and where shall we find a more striking instance than is here afforded us of that union of simplicity and reverence, that clear perception of the unseen, yet recognition of the mysterious, which is the characteristic of the first years of human existence? To the monk heaven was next door; he formed no plans, he had no cares; the ravens of his father Benedict were ever at his side. He "went forth" in his youth "to his work and to his labour" until the evening of life; if he lived a day longer, he did a day's work more; whether he lived many days or few, he laboured on to the end of them. He had no wish to see further in advance of his journey, than where he was to make his next stage. He ploughed and sowed, he prayed, he meditated, he studied, he wrote, he taught, and then he died and went to heaven. He made his way into the labyrinthine forest, and he cleared just so much of space as his dwelling required, suffering the high solemn trees and the deep pathless thicket to close him in. And when he began to build, his architecture was suggested by the scene,—not the scientific and masterly conception of a great whole with many parts, as the Gothic style in a later age, but plain and inartificial, the adaptation of received fashions to his own purpose, and an

addition of chapel to chapel, and a wayward growth of cloister, according to the occasion, with half-concealed shrines and unexpected recesses, with paintings on the wall as by a second thought, with an absence of display and a wild, irregular beauty, like that of the woods by which he was at first surrounded. And when he would employ his mind, he turned to Scripture, the book of books, and there he found a special response to the peculiarities of his vocation; for there supernatural truths stand forth as the trees and flowers of Eden in a divine disorder, as some awful intricate garden or paradise, which he enjoyed the more because he could not catalogue its wonders. Next he read the Holy Fathers, and there again he recognised a like ungrudging profusion and careless wealth of precept and consolation. And when he began to compose, still he did so after that mode which nature and revelation had taught him, avoiding curious knowledge, content with incidental ignorance, passing from subject to subject with little regard to system, or care to penetrate beyond his own homestead of thought,—and writing, not with the sharp logic of disputants, or the subtle analysis of philosophers, but with the one aim of reflecting in his pages, as in a faithful mirror, the words and works of the Almighty, as they confronted him, whether in Scripture and the Fathers, or in that “mighty maze” of deeds and events, which men call the world’s history, but which to him was a Providential Dispensation.

Here the beautiful character in life and death of St. Bede naturally occurs to us, who is, in his person and his writings, as truly the pattern of a Benedictine, as is St. Thomas of a Dominican; and with an extract from the letter of Cuthbert to Cuthwin concerning his last hours, which, familiarly as it is known, is always pleasant to read, we break off our subject for the present.

“He was exceedingly oppressed,” says Cuthbert of St. Bede, “with shortness of breathing, though without pain, before Easter Day, for about a fortnight; but he rallied, and was full of joy and gladness, and gave thanks to Almighty God day and night and every hour, up to Ascension Day; and he gave us,

his scholars, daily lectures, and passed the rest of the day in singing the Psalms, and the night too in joy and thanksgiving, except the scanty time which he gave to sleep. And as soon as he woke, he was busy in his customary way, and he never ceased with uplifted hands giving thanks to God. I solemnly protest never have I seen or heard of any one who was so diligent in thanksgiving.

“He sang that sentence of the blessed Apostle Paul, ‘It is a dreadful thing to fall into the hands of the Living God,’ and many other passages of Scripture, in which he warned us to shake off the slumber of the soul, by anticipating our last hour. And he sang some verses of his own in English also, to the effect that no one could be too well prepared for his end—viz., in calling to mind, before he departs hence, what good or evil he has done, and how his judgment will lie. And he sang too the antiphons, of which one is, ‘O King of Glory, Lord of Angels, who this day hast ascended in triumph above all the heavens, leave us not orphans, but send the promise of the Father upon us, the Spirit of Truth, alleluia.’ And when he came to the words, ‘leave us not orphans,’ he burst into tears, and wept much. He said, too, ‘God scourgeth every son whom He receiveth,’ and, with St. Ambrose, ‘I have not so lived as to be ashamed to have been among you, nor do I fear to die, for we have a good Lord.’

“In those days, besides our lectures and the Psalmody, he was engaged in two works; he was translating into English the Gospel of St. John as far as the words, ‘But what are these among so many,’ and some extracts from the *Notæ*¹ of Isidore. On the Tuesday before Ascension Day, he began to suffer still more in his breathing, and his feet were slightly swollen. However, he went through the day, dictating cheerfully, and he kept saying from time to time, ‘Take down what I say quickly, for I know not how long I am to last, or whether my Maker will not take me soon.’ He seemed to us to be quite

¹ The Bollandists have not been able to determine which of St. Isidore’s works is here intended; it is not wonderful that we have as little succeeded in the attempt.

aware of the time of his going, and he passed that night in giving of thanks, without sleeping. As soon as morning broke, that is on the Wednesday, he urged us to make haste with the writing which we had begun. We did so till nine o'clock, when we walked in procession with the Relics of the Saints, according to the usage of that day. But one of our party said to him, 'Dearest Master, one chapter is still wanting; can you bear our asking you about it?' He answered, 'I can bear it; take your pen and be ready, and write quickly.' At three o'clock he said to me, 'Run fast, and call our priests, that I may divide among them some little gifts which I have in my box.' When I had done this in much agitation, he spoke to each, urging and intreating them all to make a point of saying Masses and prayers for him. Thus he passed the day in joy until the evening, when the above-named youth said to him, 'Dear Master, there is yet one sentence not written;' he answered, 'Write quickly.' Presently the youth said, 'Now it is written;' he replied, 'Good, thou hast said the truth; *consummatum est*; take my head into thy hands, for it is very pleasant to me to sit facing my old praying place, and thus to call upon my Father.' And so, on the floor of his cell, he sang, 'Glory be to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' and, just as he had said 'Holy Ghost,' he breathed his last, and went to the realms above."

It is remarkable that this flower of the Benedictine school died on the same day as St. Philip Neri,—Thursday, May 26th, which in Bede's instance was Ascension Day, and in Philip's the feast of Corpus Christi. It was fitting that two saints should go to heaven together, whose mode of going thither was the same; both of them singing, praying, working, and guiding others in joy and exultation, till their very last hour.

THE BENEDICTINE CENTURIES.¹

WE read in history of great commanders, who, when an overwhelming force was directed against them on the plain, and success was for the time impossible, submitted to necessity, and, with plans afterwards to be developed, retired up the mountain passes in their rear, where nature had provided a safe halting-place for brave men who could not advance, and would not turn in flight. There, behind the lofty crag, the difficult morass, and the thick wood, they nursed their confidence of victory, and waited patiently for an issue, which was not less certain because it was delayed. On came the haughty foe with cries of defiance; and, when at length he thought he had them at his mercy, he found that first he must do battle with the adamantine rocks, which sternly rose up in defence of fugitives who had invoked their aid. Then he stood for a while irresolute, till the difficulties of his position ended his deliberation and forced upon him a retreat in his turn, while the lately besieged hosts were once more in motion, and pressed upon the baffled foe, who had neither plan of campaign nor base of operations to fall back upon.

Such is the history of Christian civilisation. It gave way before the barbarians of the north and the fanatics of the south; it fled into the wilderness with its own books and those of the old social system which it was succeeding. It obeyed the direction given it in the beginning,—when persecuted in one place, to flee away to another; but at length the hour of retribution came, and it advanced into the territories from which it had retired. St. Benedict is the historical emblem of its retreat, and St. Dominic of its return.

We do not say that its retreat in the first centuries was in

¹ From *The Atlantis* for January 1859.

order to its return in the mediæval. There was no oracular voice which proclaimed what would be the course of the war ; no secret tradition which whispered to the initiated the tactic that ought to be pursued. It is a sufficient explanation of the double movement, that they who feel their weakness are used to give way, and they who feel their strength are used to push forward. The corruptions of Roman society caused Christians to despair of ever mending it, and to look out for that better world which was destined to supersede it. The evil which they experienced, the good for which they sighed, the promise in which they confided, wrought in them the persuasion that the end of all things was at hand ; and this persuasion made them patient under inconveniences which were only temporary. "Behold, my brethren," says Pope Gregory about the year 600, "we already see with our eyes, what we are used to hear in prophecy. Day by day is the world assaulted by fresh and thickening blows. Out of that innumerable Roman *plebs* what a remnant are ye at this day ! yet incessant scourges are still in action ; sudden adversities thwart you ; new and unforeseen slaughters wear you away. For, as in youth the body is in vigour, the chest is strong, the neck muscular, and the arms plump, but in old age the stature is bent, the neck is withered and stooping, the chest pants, the energies are feeble, and breath is wanting for the words ; so the world too once was vigorous, robust for the increase of its kind, green in its health, and opulent in its resources, but now on the contrary it is laden with the weight of years, and is fast sinking into the grave by its ever-multiplying maladies. Beware then of giving your heart to that, which, as even your senses tell you, cannot last for ever."¹ Commonly the presentiment wore a more definitely supernatural expression than is found in this extract. Not sense merely, but the prophecies were invoked, which spoke of that great enemy of the Church, who was to be the herald of the second Advent ; and the rudiments of a new order of things were descried in the manifest tokens of an expiring world.

¹ *Hom. i. i.*

In all times indeed the multitude, whether from religious feeling or from superstition, is prone to portend some impending catastrophe from the occurrence of any startling phenomenon of nature. An eclipse, a comet, a volcanic eruption, is to them the omen of coming evil. But in the early centuries of the Church, the expectation extended to the learned and the saintly. It was the posture of mind of professors and doctors. As St. Gregory looked out for Antichrist in the sixth century, so did the Martyrs of Lyons in the second, St. Cyprian in the third, St. Hilary and St. Chrysostom in the fourth, and St. Jerome in the fifth. It was the sober judgment of the wisest and most charitable, that the world was too bad to mend, and that destruction was close upon it.

What would be the practical result of such a belief? That which we have partly described in an article, of which the present is a continuation ;¹ evidently, to leave the world to itself. Evils which threaten to continue, we try to remedy ; but what was the use of spending one's strength in reforming a state of things, which would go to pieces, if let alone, and, if ever so much meddled with, would go to pieces too, nay, the sooner perhaps, for the meddling ? It was then the prevalent disposition, as we have said, of Christians of the first centuries, and no irrational disposition, either to leave the world, or to put up with it, not to set about influencing it. "Let us go hence," said the angels in the doomed sanctuary of the chosen people. "Come ye out of her, my people," was the present bidding of inspiration. Those who would be perfect, obeyed it, and became monks. Monachism therefore was a sort of recognised emigration from the old world. St. Antony had found out a new coast, the true *eldorado* or gold country ; and on the news of it thousands took their departure year after year for the diggings in the desert. The monks of Egypt alone soon became an innumerable host. As times got worse, Basil in the East, and Benedict in the West, put themselves at the head of fresh colonies, bound for

¹ We may here set right our translation of the word "siligo" in that article. It is rye, as well as wheat, and has that meaning in the passage quoted.

the land of perpetual peace. There they sat them down, over against Babylon, and waited for the coming judgment and the end of all things. Those who remained in the world, waited too. To undergo patiently what was, to make the best of it, to use it, as far as it could be used, for religious purposes, was their wisdom and their resolve. If they took another course, they would be wasting strength and hope upon a shadow, and losing the present for a future which would never come. They had no large designs or profound policy. It was their aim that things should just last their time. They patched them up as best they might; they made shift, and lived from hand to mouth; and they followed events, rather than created them. Nor, when they undertook great labours, and began works pregnant with consequences, did they perceive whither they were going.

How different in this respect is the spirit of the first Gregory, already cited, from that of Hildebrand the Seventh! Gregory the First did not understand his own act, when he converted the Anglo-Saxons; nor Ambrose, when he put Theodosius to penance. The great Christian Fathers laid anew the foundations of the world, while they thought that its walls were tottering to the fall, and that they already saw the fires of judgment through the chinks. They refuted Arianism, which they named the forerunner of the last woe, with reasonings which were to live for ages; and they denounced the preachers of a carnal millennium, without anticipating that glorious temporal reign of the saints which was to be fulfilled in mediæval times. They propounded broad principles, but did not carry them out into their inevitable consequences. How slow were they to define doctrine, when disputes arose about its meaning or its bearing! How little jealous were they of imperial encroachments on ecclesiastical rights, when they are viewed by the side of the great Popes who came after them! How tamely do they conduct themselves, when the civil magistrate interferes with their jurisdiction, or takes the initiative in points of discipline or order, in questions of property, and matrimonial causes! How contented or resigned are they to avail themselves of such education as the state provided for their use; sending their

children to the pagan schools, before they have teachers of their own, and, even when at length they have them, adopting the *curriculum* of studies which those pagan schools had devised !

In fact, "the wish was father to the thought." Religious minds will always desire, will always be prone to believe, the approach of that happier order of things which sooner or later is to be. This hope was the form in which the deep devotion of those primitive times showed itself; and if it did not continue in its full expression beyond them, this was because experience had thrown a new light upon the course of Divine Providence. With the multitude, indeed, as we have said, who know little of history, and in whom religious fear is a chief element, the anticipation of the last day revived, and revives, from time to time. At the end of the tenth century, when a thousand years had passed over the Church, the sense of impending destruction was so vivid as even to affect the transfer and disposal of property, and the repair of sacred buildings. However, when we seek in theologians for the apprehension, we shall find that it is a characteristic of the old Empire far more than of the barbarian kingdoms which succeeded to it. The barbarian world was young, as the Roman world was effete. Youth is the season of hope; and, according as things looked more cheerful, so did they look more lasting, and to-day's sunshine became the sufficient promise of a long summer. A fervent preacher here or there, St. Norbert or St. Vincent Ferrer, may have had forebodings of the end of all things; or an astrologer or a schismatising teacher may have traded on the belief; but the men of gravity and learning after the time of Gregory, for the most part, set their faces against speculations about the future.

Bede, after speaking of the six ages of the world, says, that "as no one of the former ages has consisted exactly of a thousand years, it follows that the sixth too, under which we live, is of uncertain length, known to him alone who has bidden his servants watch. For," he continues, "whereas all saints naturally love the hour of his advent, and desire it to be near, still, we run into danger, if we presume to conclude or to proclaim, either

that the hour is near or that it is far off.”¹ Raban and Adson, who witnessed or heard of the splendours of Charlemagne, go so far as to indulge the vision of a great king of the Franks, who, in time to come, is to reign religiously, ere the fulfilment of the bad times of the end.² Theodulf indeed predicts that they were coming; but, even when the popular excitement was at its height, in the last years of the tenth century, Richard and Abbo of Fleury, and the Adson above mentioned, set themselves against it. Hardly was the dreaded crisis over, when men took heart, and began to restore and decorate the churches; hardly had the new century run its course, when Pope Paschal the Second held a Council at Florence against the archbishop of that city, who had preached of the coming end.³ Such was the change of sentiment which followed after the Pontificate of St. Gregory, the last and saddest of a line of Fathers who thought the world was on the verge of dissolution.

The names which we have been introducing, show that, among these converts from a despairing view of things, were Benedictine monks, members of those very associations which had given up the world as lost, and had quitted it accordingly. And their position in their own body is sufficient evidence that what they held, their brethren held too; and that the actual changes in the social fabric had been followed by a change of sentiment also in these religious bodies. When we look into history, to see what these authors were, as well as who, we find the fact plain beyond all denial; for the monk Alcuin was Charlemagne’s instructor, and head of the school of the palace; the monk Theodulf was a political *employé* of the same Emperor, and Bishop of Orleans; and the monk Raban was Archbishop of Mayence. How could the cloister-loving monk have come to such places of station, without some singular change in his sentiments? And these

¹ *De Rat. Temp.*, 66, 67. Elsewhere, he speaks of *futura tempora sub Antichristo*, in *Sam.* iv. 2, p. 300.

² Raban, *De Antichr.*, Opp. t. vi. p. 178. Adson, *ap. Alcuin*, t. ii. p. 529.

³ So Malvenda, t. i. p. 118, calling the prelate “Fluentinus,” which sounds like a name of place. Ughelli is silent, Baronius almost so.

instances, it must be allowed, are only samples of a phenomenon which is not uncommon in these centuries. Here then we have something to explain. Why should Benedictines leave those sweet country-homes which St. Benedict bequeathed to them, for the haunts of men, the seats of learning, archiepiscopal sees, and king's courts? St. Jerome had said, when Monachism was young: "If the priest's office be your choice, if a bishop's work or dignity be your attraction, live a town life, and save your soul in saving others. But, if you wish to be a monk, that is a solitary, in fact as well as in name, what have you to do with towns?" "A monk's office," he says elsewhere, "is not a teacher's but a mourner's, who bewails either himself or the world."¹ This, doubtless, was the primary aim and badge of the religious institute; and if, among uncongenial offices, there be one more uncongenial to it than another, it was that of a ruler or a master. The monk did not lecture, teach, controvert, lay down the law, or give the word of command; and for this simple reason, because he did not speak at all, because he was bound to silence. He had given up the use of his tongue, and could neither be preacher nor disputant. It follows, we repeat, that a singular change must have taken place by the ninth century in the ecclesiastical position of a monk, when we find instances of his acting so differently from St. Jerome's teaching and example in the fifth.

We touched, in our former article, upon this seeming anomaly in the history of the Benedictines, while we were describing them in outline; if we did not then dwell upon it and investigate its limits, this was because we thought it advisable first to trace out the general idea of the monastic state, with as little interruption as was possible, without risking the confusion which would arise in our delineation from a premature introduction of the historical modifications to which that idea has actually been subjected. Now, however, the time has come for taking up what in that former sketch we passed over; and we propose in this article accordingly, after a brief reference to the circumstances under which these modifications appeared, and to the extent to which they spread, to direct attention to the principal

¹ *Ad Paulin.*, Ep. 58; *adv. Vigil.*, fin.

instance of them—viz., the literary employments of the monks, and to show how singularly, after all, these employments, as carried out, were in keeping with the main idea of the monastic rule, even though they seem at first sight scarcely contained in its letter. We stated, when we originally opened our subject, that the substance of the monastic life was “*summa quies*”; that its object was rest, its state retirement, and its occupations such as were unexciting, and had their end in themselves. That the literature in question was consistent with these conditions will be clearly seen, when we come to describe it; first, however, let us allude to the circumstances which called for it, and the hold which it had upon the general body.

It is rare, indeed, to find the profession and the history of any institution running exactly in one and the same groove. The political revolutions which issued in the rule of Charlemagne, changing, as they did, the currents of the world, and the pilotage of St. Peter’s bark, became a severe trial of the consistency of an Order like the Benedictine, of which the maxims and the aims are grave, definite, and fixed. Demands of action and work would be made on it by the exigencies of the times, at variance with its genius, and it would find itself in the dilemma of failing in efficiency on the one hand, or in faithfulness to its engagements on the other. It would be incurring either the impatience of society, which it disappointed, or the remonstrances of its own subjects, whom it might be considered to betray.

And indeed a greater shock can hardly be fancied than that which would overtake the peaceful inhabitant of the cloister, on his finding that, after all, he so intimately depended still upon the world, which he had renounced, and that the changes which were taking place in its condition, were affecting his own. Such men, whether senators like Paulinus, or courtiers like Arsenius, or legionaries like Martin, had one and all in their respective places and times left the responsibilities of earth for the anticipations of heaven.¹ They had sought, in the lonely wood or the silent

¹ “*Omnibus idem propositus scopus erat, idemque finis, nempe secessus a sæculi tumultu et corruptelis.*” Mabillon, *Annal.*, t. i. p. 215.

mountain top, the fair uncorrupted form of nature, which spoke only of the Creator. They had retired into deserts, where they could have no enemies but such as fast and prayer could subdue. They had gone where the face of man was not, except as seen in pale, ascetic apparitions like themselves. They had secured some refuge, whence they might look round at the sick world in the distance, and see it die. But, when that last hour came, it did but frustrate all their hopes, and, for an old world at a distance, they found they had a young world close to them. The old order of things died indeed, but a new order took its place, and they themselves, by no will or expectation of their own, were in no small measure its very life. The lonely Benedictine rose from his knees, and found himself a city. This was the case, not merely here or there, but everywhere; Europe was new mapped, and the monks were the principle of mapping. They had grown into large communities, into abbeys, into corporations with civil privileges, into landholders with tenants, serfs, and baronial neighbours; they had become centres of population, the schools of the most cherished truths, the shrines of the most sacred confidences. They found themselves priests, rulers, legislators, feudal lords, royal counsellors, missionary preachers, controversialists; and they comprehended that, unless they fled anew from the face of man, as St. Antony in the beginning, they must bid farewell to the hope of leading St. Antony's life.

In this choice of difficulties, when there was a duty to stay and a duty to take flight, the monastic bodies were not unwilling to come to a compromise with the age, and, reserving their fidelity to St. Benedict, to undertake those functions to which both the world and the Church called them. Such, that is, for the most part, was the resolve of those who found themselves in this perplexity; but it could not be supposed that there were no Antonies on earth still, and that these would be satisfied to adopt it. On the contrary, there were holy men who were but impelled into a reaction of the most rigid asceticism by this semblance of a reconciliation between their brethren and the world. Such was St. Romuald in the tenth century, the founder of the Camaldolese, who, through a long life of in-

credible austerities, was ever forming new monastic stations, and leaving them when formed, from love of solitude. Such St. Bruno, the founder of the Carthusians, whose conversion, as described in the well-known legend, points to the union in his day of intellectual gifts and dissoluteness of life. "Come, dear friends," he is represented as saying to some companions, "what is to become of us? If a man of this doctor's rank and repute, of such literary, such scientific attainments, of such seeming-virtuous life, of so wide a reputation, is thus indubitably damned, what is to become of poor creatures of no estimation, such as we are?"¹ Such, again, was St. Stephen of Grandimont, who, when two Cardinals came to see and wonder at him in his French desert, excused himself by saying, "How could we serve churches and undertake cures, who are dead to the world, and have every member of our body cut off from this life, with neither feet to walk, nor tongues to speak withal?"² These, and others such, sought out for themselves a seclusion and silence most congenial to the original idea of monachism, but incompatible with those active duties,—missions, the pastoral office, teaching in the schools, and disputations with heresy,—which at the time there were none but monks to fulfil.

Would that nothing worse than the demand of such sacred duties brought the monasteries into the world, and drove these reformers into the desert! It cannot be denied that the gravest moral disorders had arisen within their walls; and that, partly indeed from the seductions of ease, wealth, and the homage of mankind, but, in a great measure also from the political troubles of the times, which exposed them to the tyranny of the military chief, or the violence of the marauder. Relaxation will easily take place in a religious community, when, from whatever circumstance, it cannot observe its rule; and what orderly observance could there be, when the country round about was the seat of war and rapine? Nay, a simpler process of monastic degeneracy followed from the high hand of military power. Kings seized the temporalities of the abbeys for their favourites,

¹ Martin, *Ampl. Coll.*, t. vi. p. 153.

² *Ibid.*, p. 1063.

and made licentious soldiers bishops and abbots ; and these, by their terrors and their bribes, fostered a lax irreligious party in the heart of these communities up and down the country. This part of the history, however, does not concern us in these pages, which are devoted to the consideration of the real work of the Benedictine, not to the injuries or interruptions which it has sustained, or to corruptions which are not its own.

On the other hand, not kings alone interfered with St. Benedict. A not less forcible overruling of his tradition took place from another quarter, where there was authority for the act, and where nothing would be done except on religious principles and with religious purposes. It was a more serious interference, for the very reason that it was a legal one, proceeding from the Church herself. According to the maxim, "*sacramenta propter homines*," she has never hesitated to consider, in this sense of the maxim, that "the end justifies the means;" and, since Regulars of whatever sort are her own creation, she can of course alter, or adapt, or change, or bring to nought, according as her needs require, the institutions which she has created. Necessity has no law, and charity has no reserves; and she has acted accordingly. She brought the Benedictine from his cloister into the political world; but, as far as she did so, let it be observed, it was her act, and not his. If, then, on account of the necessities of the day, she has overruled his resolve, and made him do what neither his tradition nor his wishes suggested, such instances cannot fairly be taken, either as specimens of Benedictine work, or as modifications of the Benedictine idea.

And such cases abound. St. Benedict himself had with difficulty contemplated the idea of a priest in the ranks of his children; laying it down in his Rule, "If a priest asks to be received in any monastery, his request must not quickly be granted; but if he persists, the whole discipline of the rule is binding on him without any relaxation" (c. 60). But Pope Gregory, who had himself been torn violently from the cloister, spared his religious brethren as little as he had himself been spared. He made a number of them bishops. From his own

convent on the Cælian he sent Augustine and his companions to be apostolic missionaries to the Anglo-Saxons, and he designed to put the entire episcopate and priesthood of the newly converted race, and thereby their secular concerns, into the hands of the monks.¹ As to the Archbishops of Canterbury, they actually were monks down to the twelfth century.² This is but a specimen of what was carried out by the Holy See on the Continent in the centuries which followed Gregory; but here too the Pope's action is external to the Benedictines, who are as little compromised by his consecrating hand as by the iron glove of the feudal tyrant.

To whatever extent, however, these innovations went, whether they were simple profanations, or were made and ratified by the wise policy of those who had a right to make them, and whatever show they make in history from the circumstance of their necessary connection with public events, with principal cities, and with prominent men, we cannot speak of them as constituting any great exception to the monastic discipline, or as exerting any considerable influence on the monastic spirit, till we have surveyed the religious institutions of Christendom as a whole, and measured them by the side of the general view thus obtained. We had occasion in our former article to allude to the condition of the early monks, their various families, the rise of the Benedictines, and the process of assimilation and absorption, by which at length St. Benedict gathered under his own rule the disciples of St. Martin, St. Cæsarius, and St. Columban. And even when the whole monastic body was Benedictine, it was not on that account moulded upon one type, or depended upon one centre. As it had not spread out from one origin, so it neither was homogeneous in its construction, nor simple and concordant in its action. It propagated itself variously, and had much of local character in its secondary dispositions. We

¹ Thomass., *Disc. Eccles.*, t. i. p. 674.

² "Uno excepto, qui ob hanc præsumptionem et alia depositus per Romanum Pontificem fuit." *Eadmer ap. Nat. Alex.*, t. vi. p. 599. St. Thomas in consequence made himself a monk, when he came to the see.

cannot be certain what it was in one place, by knowing what it was in another. One house attained more nearly to what may be called its normal idea than another, and therefore we have no right to argue that such quasi-secularisations as we have noticed, extended much further than those particular cases which history has handed down to us.

And then, on the other hand, we must bear in mind how vast was the whole multitude of persons who professed the monastic life, and, compared with it, how small was the number of those who were called away to active political duties or who gave themselves to study. They might all be subtracted from the sum-total of religious, and, as far as number goes, they would not have been missed. We have already referred to the exuberance of Egyptian monachism. Antony left to Pachomius the rule of 50,000. Posthumus of Memphis presided over 5000; Ammon over 3000. In the one city of Oxyrinchus there were 10,000. Hilarion in Syria had from 2000 to 3000. Martin of Gaul was followed to the grave by 2000 of his disciples. At that date, the sees of the whole of Christendom, according to Bingham, did not go much beyond 1,700.¹ If every bishop then had been a monk, the general character of monastic life would not have been much affected. In a later age, the monastery of Bangor contained 2000; that of Banchor, county Down, according to St. Bernard, "many thousand monks," one of whom founded as many as 100 monasteries in various places.² Again, the Episcopal Sees of France are given in the *Gallia Christiana* as 160, including the provinces of Utrecht, Cologne, and Treves; and precisely that number of monastic houses is said to have been founded in that country by St. Maur alone, in the very first years of the Benedictines. Trithemius at the end of the fifteenth century numbers the Benedictine convents as 15,000;³ and, though we are not to suppose that each of them had the 2000 subjects which we find at Bangor, the lowest average

¹ Thomass., *Disc. Eccles.*, t. i. p. 702. Gibbon, ch. xxxvii. Bing., *Antiqu.*, b. 9.

² Cambden, *Hist.*, vol. iii. p. 618.

³ Milman, *Latin Christ.*, vol. i. p. 398.

will swell the sum-total of monks to a vast multitude. In the beginning of the previous century, a census of the Benedictines was taken by John the Twenty-second, to which Helyot refers, according to which the Order, from its commencement up to that time, had had 22,000 archbishops and bishops, and of saints alone 40,000. Vague calculations or statements are sufficient to represent general truths; it is difficult to determine what is the percentage of heroic virtue in a population of regulars; if we say at random, as many as five in the hundred, even at this high rate the Episcopal portion would be only a thirty-seventh part of the whole number of Benedictines.

More data, then, than we need, will be left to us in history to ascertain the monastic vocation, even though we strike out from the list of its disciples every monk who took any secular office, as of prelate, lecturer, or disputant; nay, though we formed all those who undertook such duties into evidence of an opposite mode of life. But in fact, these very men, who in one way or another were engaged in work, which St. Benedict has not recognised by name, are themselves specimens of fidelity to their founder; and impress the Benedictine type of sanctity upon their literary or political undertakings. The proverb, "*naturam expellas furca,*" etc., holds true of religion. Whatever has life has in it a conservative principle, and a power of assimilation: Where the religious spirit was strong, it would overcome obstacles in its exercise, and revive after overthrows, and would make for itself preternatural channels for its operations, when its legitimate course was denied to it. Neither the functions of an apostle, nor of a schoolmaster, are much akin to those of a monk; nevertheless, in a given individual, they may be reconciled, or the one merged in the other. The Benedictine missionary soon relapsed into the laborious husbandman; the champion of the faith flung his adversary, and went back to his plough or his pen; the bishop, like Peter Damian, effected, or like Boniface, contemplated, a return in his old age to the cloister which he had left. As to the Schools of learning, it will be our business now to show how undisputatious was the master, and how unexciting the studies.

The rise and extension of these Schools seems to us as great an event in the history of the Order as the introduction of the sacerdotal office into the number of its functions. If Pope Gregory took a memorable step in turning monks of his convent into missionary bishops charged with the conversion of England, much more remarkable was the act of Pope Vitalian, in sending the old Greek monk Theodore to the same island, to fill the vacant see of Canterbury. We call it more remarkable, because it introduced an actual tradition into the Benedictine houses, and consecrated a system by authority. It is true that from an early date in the history of monachism, extensive learning had been combined with the profession of a monk. St. Jerome was only too fond of the Cicero and Horace, whom he put aside; and, if out of the whole catalogue of ecclesiastics we had to select a literary Father, the monk Jerome, *par excellence*, would be he. In the next century Claudian Mamercus, of Vienne, employed the leisure which his monastic profession gave him to gain an extensive knowledge of Greek and Latin literature. He collected a library of Greek, Roman, and Christian books, "quam totam, monachus," says Sidonius of him, "virente in ævo, secreta bibit institutione."¹ And in the century after, Cassiodorus, the cotemporary of St. Benedict, is well known for combining sacred and classical studies in his monastery. The tradition, however, of the cloister was up to that time against profane literature, and Theodore reversed it.

This celebrated man made his appearance at the end of the century which the missionary Augustine opened, and just about the time when the whole extent of England had been converted to the Christian faith. He brought with him Greek as well as Latin Classics, and set up schools for both the learned languages in various parts of the country. Henceforth the curriculum of the Seven Sciences is found in the Benedictine schools. From Theodore² proceeded Egbert and the school of York; from Egbert came Bede and the school of Jarrow;

¹ Mabillon, *Annal' Bened.*, t. i. p. 32.

² Vide Daniel, *Études classiques*, p. 100, etc.; Launoy, *De Scholis.*, Opp. t. iv. 1.

from Bede, Alcuin, and the schools of Charlemagne at Paris, Tours, and Lyons. From these came Raban and the school of Fulda; from Raban, Walafrid and the school of Richenau; Lupus and the school of Ferrières. From Lupus, Heiric, Remi, and the school of Rheims; from Remi, Odo of Cluni; from the dependencies of Cluni, the celebrated Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester the Second, and Abbo of Fleury, whom we have already introduced to the reader's notice, though not by name, in the former part of this sketch, as repaying a portion of the debt which the Franks owed to the Anglo-Saxons, by opening the schools of Ramsey Abbey, after the inroad of the Danes.

And now, at length, in addressing ourselves to the question, how such studies can be considered in keeping with the original idea of the monastic state, we think it right to repeat an explanation, which we made at an earlier stage of our discussion, to the effect that we are proposing nothing more than a survey of the venerable order of St. Benedict from without; and we claim leave to do as much as this by the same right by which the humblest amongst us may freely and without offence gaze on sun, moon, and stars, and form his own private opinion, true or false, of their materials and their motions. And with this proviso, we remind the reader, if we have not sufficiently done so in our present pages, that the one object, immediate as well as ultimate, of Benedictine life, as history presents it to us, was to live in purity and to die in peace. The monk proposed to himself no great or systematic work, beyond that of saving his soul. What he did more than this, was the accident of the hour, spontaneous acts of piety, the sparks of mercy or beneficence, struck off in the heat, as it were, of his solemn religious toil, and done over almost as soon as they began to be. If to-day he cut down a tree, or relieved the famishing, or visited the sick, or taught the ignorant, or transcribed a page of Scripture, this was a good in itself, though nothing was added to it to-morrow. He cared little for knowledge, even theological, or for success, even though it was religious. It is the character of such a man to be contented,

resigned, patient, and incurious ; to create or originate nothing ; to live by tradition. He does not analyse, he marvels ; his intellect attempts no comprehension of this multiform world, but on the contrary it is hemmed in, and shut up within it. It recognises but one cause in nature and in human affairs, and that is the First and Supreme ; and why things happen day by day in this way, and not in that, it refers immediately to his will.¹ It loves the country, because it is his work ; but “man made the town,” and he and his works are evil. This is what may be called the Benedictine idea, then viewed in the abstract ; and, as being such, we gave it the title of “poetical,” when contrasted with that of other religious orders ; and we did so, because we considered we saw in it a congeniality, *mutatis mutandis*, to the spirit of a Poet, who has perhaps greater title to that high name than any one else, as having received a wider homage, and that among nations in time, place, and character, further removed from each other.²

¹ “Quoties videtur contra naturam aliquid evenire, quodammodo non contra naturam est, quia rerum natura hoc habet eximium, ut a quo est, semper ejus obtemperet jussis.” *Paschas.*, p. 155, Opp. ed. 1618.

² This analogy between the monastic institute and Virgil is recognised by Cassiodorus, who, after impressing on his monks, in the first place, the study of Holy Scripture and the Fathers, continues : “However, the most holy Fathers have passed no decree, binding us to repudiate secular literature ; for in fact such reading prepares the mind in no slight measure for understanding the sacred writings.” Presently, “In some cases indeed, *Frigidus obstiterit circum præcordia sanguis*,” so as to hinder a man’s perfect mastery whether of human or divine letters ; but even with but a poor measure of knowledge, *he may be able to choose the life which follows in the next verse*, “*Rura mihi et rigui placeant in vallibus amnes* ;” for “*it is even congenial to monks to have the care of a garden, to till the land, and to take interest in a good crop of apples*”—*de Inst. div. litt.* 28. Here, by-the-bye, is in fact the same contrast between the “*Felix qui*” and the “*Fortunatus est ille*,” which is suggested to the reader in our former article (*Atlant.*, vol. i. p. 17). Mr. Keble, in a passage of his beautiful Prelections, p. 648, considers Virgil to allude to Lucretius in the “*Felix*,” while he ascribes to himself the “*Fortunatus*.”

Now supposing the historical portrait of the Benedictine to be such as this, and that we were further told that he was concerned with study and with teaching, and then were asked, keeping in mind the notion of his poetry of character, to guess what books he studied and what sort of pupils he taught, we should without much difficulty conclude that Scripture would be his literature, and children would be the members of his school.¹ And if we were further asked, what was likely to be the subject-matter of the schooling imparted to these boys, probably we should not be able to make any guess at all; but we surely should not be very much surprised to be told, that the same spirit which led him to prefer the old basilicas for worship instead of any new architecture of his own inventing, and to honour his emperor or king with spontaneous loyalty more than by theological definitions, would also induce him, in the matter of education, to take up with the old books and subjects which he found ready to his hand in the pagan schools, as far as he could religiously do so, rather than venture on any experiments or system of his own.² This, as we have already intimated, was the case. He adopted the Roman curriculum, professed the Seven Sciences, began with Grammar, that is, the Latin classics, and if he sometimes finished with them, it was because his boys left him ere he had time to teach them more. His choice of subjects was his fit recompense for choosing. He adopted the Latin writers from his love of prescription, because he found them in possession. But there were in fact no writings, after Scripture, more congenial, from their fresh and natural beauty, and their absence of intellectualism, to the monastic temperament. Such were his school-books; and, as "the boy is father of the man," the little monks, who heard them read or pored over them, when they grew up, filled the atmosphere of the monastery with the tasks and

¹ "Mos in Benedictino ordine usatissimus scholas instituere, et pueros cum pietate tum fitteris imbuere." Dachery in *Lanfranc*, Opp. p. 28. Brower, *Antiqu. Fuld.*, pp. 35-38.

² On the monastic schools taking up the imperial, *vide* Guizot, *Civil.*, vol. ii. p. 100, etc. *Vide* also Ampère, *Hist. Lit.*, t. ii. p. 277.

studies with which they had been imbued in their childhood.

For so it was, strange as it seems to our ideas, these boys were monks¹—monks as truly as those of riper years. About St. Benedict's time the Latin Church innovated upon the discipline of former centuries, and allowed parents, not only to dedicate their infants to a religious life, but to do so without any power on the part of those infants, when they came to years of reason, to annul the dedication. This discipline continued for five or six centuries, beginning with the stern Spaniards, nor ending till shortly before the pontificate of Innocent the Third. Divines argued in behalf of it from the case of infant baptism, in which the sleeping soul, without being asked, is committed to the most solemn of engagements; from that of Isaac on the Mount, and of Samuel, and from the sanction of the Mosaic Law; and they would be confirmed in their course by the instances of compulsion, not uncommon in the early centuries, when high magistrates or wealthy heads of families were suddenly seized on by the populace or by synods, and against their remonstrances, tonsured, ordained, and consecrated, before they could well take breath and realise to themselves their change of station. Nor must we forget the old Roman law, the spirit of which they had inherited, and which gave to the father the power even of life and death over his refractory offspring.

However, childhood is not the age at which the severity of the law would be felt, which bound a man by his parent's acts to the service of the cloister. While these oblates were but children, they were pretty much like other children; they threw a grace over the stern features of monastic asceticism, and peopled the silent haunts of penance with a crowd of bright innocent faces. "Silence was pleased," to use the poet's language, when it was broken by the cheerful, and sometimes, it must be confessed, unruly voices of a set of school-boys. These would sometimes, certainly, be inconveniently loud, especially as St. Benedict did not exclude from his care lay-boys, destined for

¹ Thomass., *Disc. Eccles.*, t. i. p. 821.

the world. It was more than the devotion of some good monks could bear; and they preferred some strict Reform, which, among its new provisions, prohibited the presence of these uncongenial associates. But, after all, it was no great evil to place before the eyes of austere manhood and unlovely age a sight so calculated to soften and to cheer. It was not adolescence, with its curiosity, its pride of knowledge and its sensitiveness, with its disputes and emulations, with its exciting prizes and its impetuous breathless efforts, which St. Benedict undertook to teach: he was no professor in a university. His convent was an infant school, a grammar school, and a seminary: it was not an academy. Indeed, the higher education in that day scarcely can be said to exist. It was a day of bloodshed and of revolution; before the time of life came, when the university succeeds the school, the student had to choose his profession. He became a clerk or a monk, or he became a soldier.

The fierce northern warriors, who had won for themselves the lands of Christendom with their red hands, rejoiced to commit their innocent offspring to the custody of religion and of peace. Nay, sometimes with the despotic will, of which we have just now spoken, they dedicated them, from or before their birth, to the service of Heaven. They determined that some at least of their lawless race should be rescued from the contamination of blood and licence, and should be set apart in sacred places to pray for their kindred. The little beings,¹ of three or four or five years old, were brought in the arms of those who gave them life, to accept at their bidding the course in which that life was to run. They were brought into the sanctuary, spoke by the mouth of their parents, as at the font, put out their tiny hand for the sacred corporal to be wrapped round it, received the cowl, and took their place as monks in the monastic community. In the first ages of the Benedictine Order, these children were placed on a level with their oldest brethren. They took precedence according to their date of

¹ Calmet, *Reg. Bened.*, t. ii. pp. 2, 4, 116, 278, 335-36, 380, 385. *Vide* also Thomassin, *Disc. Eccles.*, t. i. p. 821, and Magagnotti's *Dissert. in Fleury's Disc. Pop. Dei.*

admission, and the grey head gave way to them in choir and refectory, if junior to them in monastic standing. They even voted in the election of abbot, being considered to speak by divine instinct, as the child who cried out, "Ambrose is Bishop."¹ If they showed waywardness in community meetings, inattention at choir, ill behaviour at table, which certainly was not an impossible occurrence, they were corrected by the nods, the words, or the blows of the grave brother who happened to be next them: it was not till an after time that they had a prefect of their own, except in school hours.

That harm came from this remarkable discipline is only the suggestion of our modern habits and ideas; that it was not expedient for all times follows from the fact that at a certain date it ceased to be permitted. However, that, in those centuries in which it was in force, its result was good, is seen in the history of those heroic men whom it nurtured, and might have been anticipated from the principle which it embodied. The monastery was intended to be the paternal home, not the mere refuge of the monk: it was an orphanage, not a reformatory; father and mother had abandoned him, and he grew up from infancy in the new family which had adopted him. He was a child of the house; there were stored up all the associations of his wondering boyhood, and there would lie the hopes and interests of his maturer years. He was to seek for sympathy in his brethren, and to give them his own in return. He lived and died in their presence. They prayed for his soul, cherished his memory, were proud of his name, and treasured his works. A pleasing illustration of this brotherly affection meets us in the life of Walafrid Strabo, Abbot of Richenau, whose poems, written by him when a boy of fifteen and eighteen, were preserved by his faithful friends, and thus remain to us at this day. Walafrid is but one out of many, whose names are known in history, dedicated from the earliest years to the cloister. St. Boniface, Apostle of Germany, was a monk at

¹ Calmet, t. ii. p. 324. This early dedication of the monk might tend to suggest or defend the abuse of boy priests. *Vide* S. Bernard, *De Off.*, Ep. 7.

the age of five ; St. Bede came to Wiremouth at the age of seven ; St. Paul of Verdun is said by an old writer to have left his cradle for the cloister ; St. Robert entered it as soon as he was weaned ; Pope Paschal the Second was taken to Cluni, Ernof to Bec, the Abbot Suger to St. Denis, from their "most tender infancy."

Infants can but gaze about at what surrounds them, and their learning comes through their eyes. In the instances we have been considering, their minds would receive the passive impressions which were made on them by the scene, and would be moulded by the composed countenances and solemn services which surrounded them. Such was the education of these little ones, till perhaps the age of seven ; when, under the title of "pueri,"¹ they commenced their formal school-time, and committed to memory their first lesson. That lesson was the Psalter—that wonderful manual of prayer and praise, which, from the time when its various portions were first composed down to the last few centuries, has been the most precious *viaticum* of the Christian mind in its journey through the wilderness. In early times St. Basil speaks of it as the popular devotion in Egypt, Africa, and Syria ; and St. Jerome had urged its use upon the Roman ladies whom he directed. All monks were enjoined to know it by heart ; the young ecclesiastics learned it by heart ; no bishop could be ordained without knowing it by heart ; and in the parish schools it was learned by heart. The Psalter, with the Lord's Prayer and Creed, constituted the *sine qua non* condition of discipleship. At home pious mothers, as the Lady Helvidia, whom we have already introduced to the reader, taught their children the Psalter. It was only, then, in observance of a universal law,² that the Benedictine children were taught it ;—they mastered it, and then they passed into the secular school-room,—they next were introduced to the study of grammar."³

¹ Calmet, t. i. p. 495.

² Thomass., *Disc.*, t. ii. p. 280, etc.

³ The following sketch is drawn up from the works of the Benedictines, in *Bibl. Max. Patr.*, tt. xiv., xv., xvii., xviii., xxi. ; Mabillon's *Acta SS. Bened.* ; Ceillier's *Auteurs*, tt. xviii.-xx. ; Neander's *Hist.*, vol. vi., Bohn ; Guizot, *Hist. Civil.*, vol. ii., Bohn ; Ampère, *Hist. Lit.*, t. iii. ; and two

By Grammar, it is hardly necessary to say, was not meant, as now, the mere analysis or rules of language, as denoted by the words etymology, syntax, prosody; but rather it stood for scholarship, that is, such an acquaintance with the literature of a language as implied the power of original composition and the *viva voce* use of it. Thus Cassiodorus defines it to be "skill in speaking elegantly, gained from the best poets and orators;" St. Isidore, "the science of speaking well;" and Raban, "the science of interpreting poets and historians, and the rule of speaking and writing well." In the monastic school, the language of course was Latin; and in Latin literature first came Virgil; next Lucan and Statius; Terence, Sallust, Cicero; Horace, Persius, Juvenal; and of Christian poets, Prudentius, Sedulius, Juvencus, Aratus. Thus we find that the monks of St. Alban's, near Mayence, had standing lectures in Cicero, Virgil, and other authors. In the school of Paderborne there were lectures in Horace, Virgil, Statius, and Sallust. Theodulf speaks of his juvenile studies in the Christian authors, Sedulius and Paulinus, Aratus, Fortunatus, Juvencus, and Prudentius, and in the classical Virgil and Ovid. Gerbert, afterwards Sylvester the Second, after lecturing his class in logic, brought it back again to Virgil, Statius, Terence, Juvenal, Persius, Horace, and Lucan. A work is extant of St. Hildebert's, supposed to be a school exercise; it is scarcely more than a cento of Cicero, Seneca, Horace, Juvenal, Persius, Terence, and other writers. Horace he must have almost known by heart.

Considering the number of authors which have to be studied in order to possessing a thorough knowledge of the Latin tongue, and the length to which those in particular run which are set down in the above lists, we may reasonably infer, that with the science of Grammar the Benedictine teaching began and ended, excepting, of course, such religious instruction as is recent works of Mgr. Landriot's *Écoles Littéraires*, and P. Daniel's *Études classiques*, to which we are much indebted for many points of detail. *Vide* also M. l'Abbé Lalanne's *Influence des Pères*, and P. Cahour's *Études classiques*.

rather the condition of Christian life than the acquisition of knowledge. At fourteen, when the term of boyhood was complete,¹ the school-time commonly ended too, the lay youths left for their secular career, and the monks commenced the studies appropriate to their sacred calling. The more promising youths' however, of the latter class were suffered or directed first to proceed to further secular studies; and, in order to accompany them, we must take some more detailed view of the curriculum, of which Grammar was the introductory study.

This curriculum,² derived from the earlier ages of heathen philosophy, was transferred to the use of the Church on the authority of St. Augustine, who in his *De Ordine* considers it to be the fitting and sufficient preparation for theological learning. It is hardly necessary to refer to the history of its formation; we are told how Pythagoras prescribed the study of arithmetic, music, and geometry; how Plato and Aristotle insisted on grammar and music, which, with gymnastics, were the substance of Greek education; how Seneca speaks, though not as approving, of grammar, music, geometry, and astronomy, as the matter of education in his own day; and how Philo, in addition to these, has named logic and rhetoric. Augustine, in his enumeration of them, begins with arithmetic and grammar, including under the latter history; then he speaks of logic and rhetoric; then of music, under which comes poetry, as equally addressing the ear; lastly, of geometry and astronomy, which address the eye. The Alexandrians, whom he followed, arranged them differently—viz., grammar, rhetoric, and logic or philosophy,³ which branched off into the four mathematical sciences of arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. And this order was adopted in Christian education, the first three sciences being called the Trivium, the last four the Quadrivium.

Grammar was taught in all these schools; but for those who wished to proceed further than the studies of their boyhood,

¹ Calmet, *Reg.*, t. i. p. 495.

Brucker, *Phil.*, t. iii. p. 594, etc. *Appul Florid.*, iv. 20.

e Quadrivium was called "philosophy." Ampère, t. iii. p. 267.

seats of higher education had been founded by Charlemagne in the principal cities of his Empire, under the name of public schools,¹ which may be considered the shadow, and even the nucleus of the universities which arose in a subsequent age. Such were the schools of Paris, Tours, Rheims, and Lyons in France; Fulda in Germany; Bologna in Italy. Nor did they confine themselves to the Seven Sciences above mentioned, though it is scarcely to be supposed that, in any science whatever, except grammar, they professed to impart more than the elements. Thus we read of St. Bruno of Segni (A.D. 1080), after being grounded in the "*litteræ humaniores*," as a boy, by the monks of St. Perpetuus near Aste, seeking the rising school of Bologna for the "*altiores scientiæ*."² St. Abbo of Fleury (A.D. 990), after mastering, in the monastery of that place, grammar, arithmetic, logic, and music, went to Paris and Rheims for philosophy and astronomy, and afterwards taught himself rhetoric and geometry. Raban (A.D. 822) left the school of Fulda for a while for Alcuin's lectures, and learned Greek of a native of Ephesus. Walafrid (A.D. 840) passed from Richenau to Fulda. St. William (A.D. 980), dedicated by his parents to St. Benedict at St. Michael's near Vercellæ, proceeded to study at Pavia. Gerbert (A.D. 990), one of the few cultivators of physics, after Fleury and Orleans, went to Spain.³ St. Wolfgang (A.D. 994), after private instruction, went to Richenau. Lupus (A.D. 840), after Ferrières, was sent for a time to Fulda. Fulbert too of Châtres (A.D. 1000), though not a monk, may be mentioned as sending his pupils in like manner to finish their studies at schools of more celebrity than his own.⁴

History furnishes us with specimens of the subjects taught in this higher education. We read of Gerbert lecturing in Aris-

¹ Charlemagne's schools taught Grammar, Rhetoric, Leges, Canones, Theology biblical and patristical. *Vide* Thomass., *Disc.*, t. iii. pp. 271-94; Ampère, *Hist.*, t. iii. p. 267.

² *Vit. ap. Brun.*, Opp. ed. 1759.

³ Brucker, t. iii. p. 646.

⁴ Thomass., *Disc.*, t. ii. pp. 296-98

tote's Categories and the Isagogæ of Porphyry; St. Theodore taught the Anglo-Saxon youths Greek and mathematics; Alcuin, all seven sciences at York; and at some German monasteries there were lectures in Greek,¹ Hebrew, and Arabic. The monks of St. Benignus at Dijon gave lectures in medicine; the abbey of St. Gall had a school of painting and engraving; the blessed Tubilo of that abbey was mathematician, painter, and musician.² We read of another monk of the same monastery, who was ever at his carpentry when he was not at the altar, and of another who worked in stone. Hence Vitruvius was in repute with them. Another accomplishment was that of copying manuscripts, which they did with a perfection unknown to the scholastic age which followed them.³

These manual arts, far more than the severer sciences, were the true complement of the Benedictine ideal of education, which, after all, was little more than a fair or a sufficient acquaintance with Latin literature. Such is the testimony of the ablest men of the time. "To pass from Grammar to Rhetoric, and then in course to the other liberal sciences," says Lupus, speaking of France, is "*fabula tantum*."⁴ "It has ever been the custom in Italy," says Glaber Radulphus, writing of the year 1000, "to neglect all arts but Grammar."⁵ Grammar, moreover, in the sense in which we have defined it, is no superficial study, nor insignificant instrument of mental cultivation, and

¹ Fredegodus of Canterbury (A.D. 960) wrote in Greek. *Vide* Cave's *Hist. Litt.* in nom. In the *Life of St. Odo of Canterbury* we read that his patron Athelm "Græca et Latina linguâ magistris edocendum eum tradidit, quarum linguarum *plerisque*, tunc temporis in gente Anglorum usus erat, a discipulis beatæ memoriæ Theodori archiepiscopi profectus. Factusque est in utraque lingua valde gnarus, ita ut posset poemata fingere, continuare prosam, et omnia, quicquid ei animo sederet, luculentissimo sermone proferre."—Mabillon, *Act. Sæc.*, v. p. 289.

² We quoted in our former article a passage from Brower on the arts cultivated at Fulda. For a parallel in the East, *vide* the account of the monks of Theodore Studita, vit. p. 29, Sismond.

³ Guizot, *Civil*, t. ii. p. 236; Hallam, *Lit.*, i. 1, 87.

⁴ *Et*. i.

⁵ *Mura'tori Dissert.*, 43, p. 831.

the school-task of the boy became the life-long recreation of the man. Amid the serious duties of their sacred vocation, the monks did not forget the books which had arrested and refined their young imagination. Let us return to the familiar correspondence of some of these more famous Benedictines, and we shall see what were the pursuits of their leisure, and the indulgences of their relaxation. Alcuin, in his letters to his friends, quotes Virgil again and again; he also quotes Horace, Terence, Pliny, besides frequent allusions to the heathen philosophers. Lupus quotes Horace, Cicero, Suetonius, Virgil, and Martial. Gerbert quotes Virgil, Cicero, Horace, Terence, and Sallust. Petrus Cellensis quotes Horace, Seneca, and Terence. Hildebert quotes Virgil and Cicero, and refers to Diogenes, Epictetus, Cræsus, Themistocles, and other personages of Greek history. Hincmar of Rheims quotes Horace. Paschasius Radbert's favourite authors were Cicero and Terence. Abbo of Fleury was especially familiar with Terence, Sallust, Virgil, and Horace; Peter the Venerable, with Virgil and Horace; Hepidamn of St. Gall took Sallust as a model of style.¹

Nor is their anxiety less to enlarge the range of their classical reading. Lupus asks Abbot Hatto through a friend for leave to copy Suetonius's *Lives of the Cæsars*, which is in the monastery of St. Boniface in two small codices. He sends to another friend to bring with him the Catilinarian and Jugurthan Wars of Sallust, the Verrines of Cicero, and any other volumes which his friend happens to know either that he has not, or possesses only in faulty copies, bidding him withal beware of the robbers on his journey. Of another friend he asks the loan of Cicero's *De Rhetoricâ*, his own copy of which is incomplete, and of Aulus Gellius. In another letter he asks the Pope for Cicero's *De Oratore*, the *Institutions* of Quintillian, and the commentary of Donatus upon Terence. In like manner Gerbert tells Abbot Gisilbert that he has the beginning of the *Ophthalmicus* of the philosopher Demosthenes, and the end of Cicero's *Pro rege*

¹ The School of Ouen produced 500 writers in fifty years. Landriot, p. 138. *Vide* the curious Letter of Gunzo, Marten., *Ampl. Coll.*, t. i. p. 294.

Deiotaro; and he wants to know if he can assist him in completing them for him. He asks a friend at Rome to send him by Count Guido the copies of Suetonius and Aurelius which belong to his archbishop and himself; he requests Constantine, the lecturer (*scholasticus*) at Fleury, to bring him Cicero's *Verrines* and *De Republicâ*, and he thanks Remigius, a monk of Treves, for having begun to transcribe for him the *Achilleid* of Statius, though he had been unable to proceed with it for want of a copy. To other friends he spoke of Pliny, Cæsar, and Victorinus. Alcuin's Library contained Pliny, Aristotle, Cicero, Virgil, Statius, and Lucan; and he transcribed Terence with his own hand.

Not only the memory of their own youth, but the necessity of transmitting to the next generation what they had learned in it themselves, kept them loyal to their classical acquirements. They were, in this aspect of their history, not unlike the fellows in our modern English universities, who first learn and then teach. It is impossible, indeed, to overlook their resemblance generally to the elegant scholar of a day which is now waning, especially at Oxford, such as Lowth or Elmsley, Copleston or Keble, Howley or Parr, who thought little of science or philosophy by the side of the authors of Greece and Rome. Nor is it too much to say, that the Colleges in the English Universities may be considered in matter of fact to be the lineal descendants or heirs of the Benedictine schools of Charlemagne.¹ The

¹ "If Colleges, with their endowments and local interests . . . are necessarily . . . of a national character, it follows that the education which they will administer will also be national, and adapted to all ranks and classes of the community. And if so, then again it follows that they will be far more given to *the study of the Arts* than to the learned professions, or to any special class of pursuits at all; and such in matter of fact has ever been the case. They have *inherited* under changed circumstances the position of *the monastic teaching founded by Charlemagne*, and have *continued* its primitive traditions, through, and in spite of, the noble intellectual developments, to which Universities have given occasion."—Newman's *Office and Work of Universities*, p. 340, 1.

modern of course has vastly the advantage in the comparison; for he is familiar with Greek, has an exacter criticism and purer taste, and a more refined cultivation of mind. He writes, verse at least, far better than the Benedictine, who had commonly little idea of it; and he has the accumulated aids of centuries in the shape of dictionaries and commentaries. We are not writing a panegyric on the classical learning of the dark age, but describing what it was; and, with this object before us, we observe, that, whatever the monks had not, a familiar knowledge and a real love they had of the great Latin writers, and we assert moreover, that that knowledge and love were but in keeping with the genius and character of their institute. For they instinctively recognised in the graceful simplicity of Virgil or of Horace, in his dislike of the great world, of political contests and of ostentatious splendour, in his unambitious temper and his love of the country, an analogous gift to that religious repose, that distaste for controversy, and that innocent cheerfulness which were the special legacy of St. Benedict to his children. This attachment to the classics is well expressed by a monk of Paderborn,¹ who, when he would describe the studies of the place, suffers his prose almost to dissolve into verse, as he names his beloved authors,

Viguit Horatius,	magnus et Virgilius,
Crispus et Sallustius,	et urbanus Statius.

<i>Ludusque fuit omnibus,</i>	<i>insudare versibus,</i>
<i>Et dictaminibus</i>	<i>jucundisque cantibus.</i>

The latter of these stanzas, as they may be called, illustrates what we have wished to express, in speaking of the classical temperament of the Benedictines. As far as they allowed themselves in any recreation, which was not of a sacred nature, they found it in these beautiful authors, who might be considered as the prophets of the human race in its natural condition. How strongly they contrast in this respect to the scholastic age which swallowed them up! Amid the religious

¹ *Vide* Daniel, p. 115. Landriot, p. 139.

or ecclesiastical matters which were the subject of their correspondence, questions of grammar and criticism are mooted, and a loving curiosity about the nicety of languages is temperately indulged. Whether *rubus* is masculine or feminine, is argued from analogy and by induction; Ambrose makes it feminine, and the names of trees, which have no plurals, are feminine, as *populus*, *fraxinus*; on the other hand Virgil makes it masculine, and Priscian allows it to be an exception to the rule. Again, is it *dispexeris* or *despexeris*? Priscian says *despicio*, and makes *de* answer to the Greek *κατά*, *down*; but the Greek in the Psalm is, not *κατῶς*, but *ὑπερῶς*, *above*. Again, is the penultima of *voluimus* long or short? long, says Servius on Virgil.¹ They carry their fidelity to the classics into their own poetical compositions; far from resigning themselves to that merely rhythmical versification, which is ever grateful to the popular ear, which had been in use from the Augustan era, and which afterwards developed in *rhyme*,² they rather affect the archaisms and the licences of the classical era. "Contraria rerum," "genus omne animantum," "retundier," "formarier," "benedicier," "scribier," "indupediret," "indunt," savour of Ennius or Lucretius rather than of Virgil. They keep to the Augustan metres, and they are never unwilling to use them. Their theological treatises begin, their epistles to kings end, with hexameters and pentameters. They moralise, they protest, they soothe their sorrows, they ask favours, they compile chronicles, they record their journeys, in heroics, elegiacs, and epigrams. They are versifiers, one and all, or at least those whose names or works are best known in history or in our libraries. The habit was formed at school, and it endured through life. Some indeed, as Lupus or Gerbert, had too many external occupations for the task; but others, as Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, return to it in the evening of life, after the manner of Gregory Nazianzen in patristic times, or Lord Wellesley in our own. Bede, Alcuin, Aldhelm, Raban, Theodulf, Hildebert, Notgar, Adelhard, Walafrid, Agobard,

¹ Alcuin, *Ep.* 23; Lupus, *Ep.*, pp. 5, 8, 20, 34.

² Vide *Muratori Dissert.*, 40.

Florus, Modoin, Heiric, Gerbert, Angilbert, Herman, Abbo, Odo, Hucbald, Lupus, Fridouard, Paschasius, with many others, all wrote verse. We are not insinuating that they wrote it so happily as the Patriarch of Constantinople or the Governor-General of India; on the contrary, it was not their *forte*; but Florus, for instance, is eloquent, and Walafrid Virgilian.¹ Their subjects, when most sacred, are such as the great phenomena of nature, the country, woods, mountains, flocks and herds, plants, flowers, and others which we have called Benedictine. We cannot occupy our pages with extracts; but we are induced, as a specimen of what we mean by the alliance of St. Benedict and Virgil, to quote the concluding lines of the *Hortulus* of Walafrid, which presents us a very pretty picture of an old monk amid children and fruit trees:—

“Hæc tibi servitii munuscula vilia parvi
 Strabo tuus, Grimalde pater ! . . .
 Ut, cum conseptu viridis consederis horti,
 Inter apricatas frondenti germine malos,
 Persicus imparibus crines ubi dividit umbris,
 Dum tibi cana legunt tenera lanugine poma
 Ludentes pueri, schola lætabunda tuorum,
 Atque volis ingentia mala capacibus indunt,
 Grandia conantes includere corpora palmis,
 Quo moneare habeas nostri, pater alme, laboris,
 Dum relegis quæ dedo volens, interque legendum
 Et vitiosa secas bonus, et placentia firmas.”

We have taken a liberty with the last line, which anyhow is somewhat feeble.

Their prose is superior to their verse; it has little claim indeed to the purity of taste and of vocabulary which we call classical; but it is good Latin both in structure and in idiom. At any rate the change is wonderful, when we pass from the Benedictine centuries to those which followed.

¹ Du Pin, however, says “Theodulf’s poems are very fine.”—*Cent.* viii., p. 126, ed. 1699. “Tolerable poetry,” says Dr. Murdock, on Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 151.

We take, for instance, a letter from Lupus to Ebroin, Bishop of Poitiers, not because it is the most favourable specimen of his style, but because it is one of the shortest of his letters:—

“Causas meas Ludovico nostro significavi, quas his litteris repetere superfluum duxi, cum eos, quæ illi redditæ sunt, vos lecturos et velim et sciam. Tantum postulo, ut in omnibus ita mihi adesse dignemini, sicut me confidere illis etiam litteris cognoscatis. Misi vobis eburneum pectinem, quem quæso, ut in vestro retineatis usu, quo inter pectendum arctior vobis mei memoria imprimatur.”—*Ep.* 39.

Or again, one of Gerbert's shortest, addressed to some lawless freebooter, who had plundered the abbey:—

“Recedant multa verba, et sequamur facta. Sanctuarium Domini mei nec pecunia nec amicitia vobis damus; nec, si datum est ab aliquo, consentimus. Fœnum, quod vestri tulerunt, beato Columbano restituite, si experiri non vultis, quid possimus cum gratia domini nostri Cæsaris, amicorum consilio et auxilio. His conditionibus leges amicitiae non refutamus.”—*Ep.* 4.

We could not bring into a small compass any comparison of the writers of the scholastic period with those whom we are reviewing; a few sentences out of each may not be considered to decide the matter, yet at least they will illustrate, as far as they go, what we have been saying. On the part of the Benedictines, we have made our selection almost at random: on the part of the Schoolmen, we have attempted to find the most favourable specimens.

For instance, Raban begins a chapter in the third book of his *De Institutione Clericorum* with the following sentence, which, whatever be thought of it otherwise, is in structure and phrase fairly Ciceronian:—

“De septem liberalibus artibus philosophorum, ad quam utilitatem discendæ sunt catholicis, satis, ut reor, superius diximus; illud adhuc adjicimus, quod philosophi ipsi qui vocantur, si qua forte vera et fidei nostræ accommodata in disputationibus suis seu scriptis dixerunt, maxime Platonici, non solum formidanda non sunt, sed ab eis etiam, tanquam injustis possessoribus, in usum nostrum vindicanda” (t. vi. p. 44).

Contrast with this a sentence from one of the *Opuscula* of St. Thomas:—

“Nihil est homini amabilius, libertate propriæ voluntatis. Per hanc enim homo est etiam aliorum dominus; per hanc aliis uti vel frui potest; per hanc etiam actibus suis dominatur. Unde, sicut homo dimittens divitias, vel personas conjunctas, eas abnegat, ita deserens propriæ voluntatis arbitrium, per quod ipse sui ipsius dominus est, se ipsum abnegare invenitur.”—*Opusc.* 17, p. 400.

For a second contrast, let us on the one hand take Paschasius, who thus writes in the beginning of his commentary on St. Matthew:—

“Unde nimirum Demetrius, Antiocho regi vim divinæ legis cum exponeret, aiebat, teste Josepho, quemdam Theopompum extitisse nomine, qui volens ex divinis litteris in sua historia quippiam contrectare, ilico mente turbatus fuit plus ferme triginta diebus, donec veniam vix precibus impetraret. Ac deinde, quod fuerit ei per visum cœlitus declaratum, hoc illi ideo accidisse, quoniam irreligiose divina scrutatus esset, atque hominibus ea proferre impuris vellet,” etc.—*Bibl. Max. P.*, t. xiv. p. 358.

On the other hand Moneta, a contemporary of St. Dominic:—

“Quod autem sit provisor animalium, patet secundum philosophos et in veritate. Dedit enim animalibus membra instrumentalia, et præter hoc intimavit eis modum utendi illis; alioquin, esset supervacaneum. . . . In quo apparet Dei providentia etiam cum non utentibus ratione” (p. 502).

Now, we must not be imagined, in making this contrast, to have any disrespectful meaning as regards those great authors whose Latinity happens not to be equal to their sanctity or their intellectual power. Their merit, in respect to language, is of a different kind; it consists in their success in making the majestic and beautiful Latin tongue minister to scientific uses, for which it was never intended. But, because they have this merit of their own, that is no reason why we should deny to the writers who preceded them the praise of being familiar with the ancient language itself, a praise which is justly theirs, though seldom

allowed to them. The writers of the Benedictine centuries are supposed to have the barbarism, without the science, of the Dominican period; and modern critics, who wish to be fair, seem to consider it a great concession, if they grant that an age must at least have some smattering in classical literature, which, as the foregoing pages show, is ever quoting it and referring to it. Thus Mr. Hallam, in the opening chapter of his *Literature of Europe*, can but say, "Alcuin's own poems *could at least not* have been written by one *unacquainted* with Virgil." Again: "From this time, though *quotations* from the Latin poets, especially Ovid and Virgil, and *sometimes* from Cicero, are *not very* frequent, they occur sufficiently to show that manuscripts had been brought to *this* side of the Alps" (p. 7). Some pages lower he says, quoting some of St. Adalhard's verses, "The quotation from Virgil in the ninth century *perhaps deserves remark, though* in one of Charlemagne's monasteries it is not by any means *astonishing*;" as if Virgil were not the text-book in the northern schools, as our foregoing quotations make clear, and ignorance, in that day, when it was to be found, had not its special seat in the southern side of the Alps, not in France and Germany. Passages such as these in men of wide research simply perplex us. We ask ourselves whether we have rightly understood their words, or whether we read wrongly the historical facts which they profess to be generalising. Perhaps it is that we assume without warrant that the quotations of Alcuin and the rest are *bonâ fide* such, and not derived, as some have said, from catenas of passages, commonplace books, or traditionary use;¹ but such an account of them is absolutely inconsistent,

¹ "Bede . . . had some familiarity with Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius, and even Lucretius. . . . It may be questioned, however, whether many of the citations from ancient authors, often adduced from mediæval writers, as indicating their knowledge of such authors, are more than traditionary, almost proverbial, insulated passages, brilliant fragments, broken off from antiquity, and reset again and again by writers borrowing them from each other, but who had never read another word of the lost poet, orator, or philosopher."—Milman, *Latin Christ.*, vol. ii. p. 39.

first, with the testimonies which we have above cited, as to the actual studies of the young, and next, with the literary habits which those studies actually formed in the persons who were exercised in them. Can it be that critics of the nineteenth century, possessing the fine appreciation of classical poetry imparted in the public schools of England, glance their eye over the rude versification of Theodulf or Alcuin, and consider it the measure of the secular learning which gave it birth? M. Guizot, Protestant as he is, is a fairer and kinder judge of the cloister literature than Mr. Hallam or Dean Milman.

And now to prevent misapprehension of our meaning in this review of the Benedictine schools, we have two remarks to make before we conclude, one on each side of the description to which that review has led us.

On the one hand, the classical studies and tastes which we have been illustrating, even though foreign to the monastic masses, as they may be called, even though historically traceable to the mission of St. Theodore from the Holy See to England, must still be regarded a true offspring of the Benedictine discipline, and in no sense the result of seasons or places of relaxation and degeneracy. At first sight, indeed, there is some plausibility in saying that with the change of times a real change came over a portion of a great family of monks, and that, however usefully employed, Cassiodorus or Theodore, Alcuin or Walafrid, did certainly fall from their proper vocation, and did really leave it to Romuald, and others like him, to be, not only the most faithful imitators, but to be only true children of the ancient monachism. And, in confirmation of this view, it might be added, that the same circumstances which led the monks to literary pursuits, led them to political entanglements also, and that in the same persons, as Theodulf, Lupus, and Gerbert, learning and secular engagements were combined; and that, as no one would say that the cares of office were proper to a monk's vocation, as little could be fairly included in its classical attainments. Whatever be the best mode of treating this difficulty, which of course demands a candid and equitable consideration, here, in addition to what we have said by the way, we shall

make one answer of different kind, which seems to us conclusive, and there leave the question. When, then, we are asked whether these studies are but the accidents and the signs of a time of religious declension, we reply that they are found in those very persons, on the contrary, who were pre-eminent in devotional and ascetic habits, and who were so intimately partakers in the spirit of mortification, whether of St. Benedict or St. Romuald, that they have come down to us with the reputation of saints,—nay, have actually received canonisation or beatification. Theodore himself is a saint; Alcuin and Raban are styled “*beati*”; Hildebert is “*venerable*”; Bede and Aldhelm are saints; and we can say the same of St. Angilbert, St. Abbo, St. Bertharius, St. Adalhard, St. Odo, and St. Paschasius Radbert. At least Catholics must feel the full force of this argument; for they cannot permit themselves to attribute any dereliction of vocation to those whom the Church holds up as choice specimens of divine power, and, as being such, miraculously sealed for eternal bliss.

This is our remark on one side the question; on the other, it must not of course be supposed—indeed our last remark negatives the idea—that critical scholarship or classical erudition was the business of life, even in the case of this minority of the monastic family, who took so prominent a part in the education of their time. We have distinctly said, that, after their school years, the monks were as little taken up with the classics, *exceptis excipiendis*, as members of parliament or country gentlemen at the present day. They had their serious engagements, as statesmen have now, though of a different kind, and to these they gave themselves. Theology was their one study; to theology secular literature ministered, first as an aid and an ornament, then as a relaxation, amid the mental exertion which it involved. Nor was this literature cultivated without some holy jealousy on the part of the cultivators; “*nuces pueris*”;—there was a time of life when it ought to be put aside; there was even a danger of its seductiveness. Alcuin himself, if we may trust the account, reproved on one occasion the study, at least of the poets; and in one of his extant letters he complains of a former pupil, then raised to the episcopate,

for preferring Virgil to his old master Flaccus, that is, himself, and prays that "the four Gospels, not the twelve *Æneids*, may fill his breast" (*Ep.* 129). St. Paschasius too, in spite of his love for Terence and Cicero, expresses a judgment, in one passage of his comment upon Ezekiel (*Bibl. Max. P.*, t. xiv. p. 788), against the elder monks being occupied with the heathen poets and philosophers. Lanfranc, when an Irish Bishop asked him some literary question, made answer, "*Episcopale propositum non decet operam dare hujusmodi studiis*; we passed in these our time of youth, but, when we took on ourselves the pastoral care, we bade them farewell" (*Ep.* 33). The instance of Pope Gregory is well known; when the Bishop of Vienne had been led to lecture in the classics, he wrote, "A fact has come to our ears, which we cannot name without a blush, that you, my brother, lecture on literature" (*grammatica*).—*Ep.* xi. 54. Such occupations, indeed, were in those centuries generally and reasonably held to be inconsistent with the calling of a Bishop.¹ St. Jerome speaks as strongly in an earlier age.

What was true of the Bishop was on the whole true of the monk also; he might perhaps have special duties as the *scholasticus* of his monastery, but ordinarily, while his manual labour was either in the field or in the *scriptorium*, so his intellectual exercises were for the most part combined with his devotional, and consisted in the study of the sacred volume. This was mainly what at that time was meant by theology. "Theologia, hoc est, Scripturarum meditatio," says Thomassin (*Disc. Eccl.*, t. ii. p. 288). Their theology was a loving study and exposition of Holy Scripture, according to the teaching of the Fathers, who had studied and expounded it before them. It was a loyal adherence to the teaching of the past, a faithful inculcation of it, an anxious transmission of it to the next generation. In this respect it differed from the theology of the times before and after them. Patristic and scholastic theology each involved a creative action of the intellect; that this is the case as regards the Schoolmen, need not be proved here; nor is it less true, though in a different way, of the theology of the Fathers.

¹ Vide Thomass., *Disc. Eccl.*, t. ii. pp. 268-86.

Origen, Tertullian, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Leo, are authors of powerful, original minds, and engaged in the production of original works. There is no greater mistake, surely, than to suppose that a revealed truth precludes originality in the treatment of it. The contrary is acknowledged in the case of secular subjects, in which it is the very triumph of originality not to invent or discover what perhaps is already known, but to make old things read as if they were new, from the novelty of aspect in which they are placed. This faculty of investing with associations, of applying to particular purposes, of deducing consequences, of impressing upon the imagination, is creative ; and though false associations, applications, deductions, and impressions are often made, and were made by some theologians of the early Church, such as Origen and Tertullian, this does but prove that originality is not coextensive with truth. And so in like manner as to Scripture ; to enter into the mind of the sacred author, to follow his train of thought, to bring together to one focus the lights which various parts of Scripture throw upon his text, and to give adequate expression to the thoughts thus evolved, in other words, the breadth of view, the depth, or the richness, which we recognise in certain early expositions, is a creation. Nor is it an inferior faculty to discriminate, rescue, and adjust the truth, which a fierce controversy threatens to tear in pieces, at a time when the ecclesiastical atmosphere is thick with the dust of the conflict, when all parties are more or less in the wrong, and the public mind has become so bewildered as not to be able to say what it does or what it does not hold, or even what it held before the strife of ideas began. In such circumstances, to speak the word evoking order and peace, and to restore the multitude of men to themselves and to each other, by a reassertion of what is old with a luminousness of explanation which is new, is a gift inferior only to that of revelation itself.

This gift is not the characteristic of the history, nor is it akin to the spirit or the object, as we have described them, of the Benedictine Order. At the time of which we are writing, the Christian athlete, after running one length of the stadium, was

taking breath before commencing a second course: the Christian combatant was securing his conquests in the wide field of thought by a careful review and catalogue of them, before going forth to make new ones. He was fitly represented, therefore, at such a season by the Benedictine, faithful, conscientious, affectionate, and obedient, like the good steward who keeps an eye on all his master's goods, and preserves them from waste or decay. First, then, he compared, emended, and transcribed the text of Scripture; next he transcribed the Fathers who directly or indirectly commented on it; then he attached to its successive portions such passages from the Fathers as illustrated them; then he fused those cated-nated passages into one homogeneous comment of his own: and there he stopped. He seldom added anything original. In such a task the skill would lie in the happy management and condensation of materials brought together from very various quarters, and here he would find the advantage of the literary habits gained in his early education. A taste for criticism would be another result of it, which we see in Bede, and which would result in so much of leaning to the literal interpretation of Scripture as was consistent with the profession of editing and republishing, as it may be called, the comments of the Fathers. We see this tendency in Alcuin, Paschasius, and especially in Druthmar. Indeed, Alcuin's greatest work was the revision of the Scripture text.¹ Other commentators were Ansbert, Smaragdus, Haymo, Remi, and the Irish Sedulius, if he was a Benedictine. The most widely celebrated, however, of these works was the *Glossa Ordinaria* of Walafrid, which was in great measure an abridgment of Raban's Catena, and became a standard authority in the centuries which followed.

But times were approaching when such peaceful labours were not sufficient for the Church's need, and when theology needed to be something more than the rehearsal of what her champions had achieved and her sages had established in ages passed away. As the new Christian society, which Charlemagne in-

¹ Codex, Alcuini labor, in Vallicellensi Bibliotheca asservatur. Baron., an. 778.

augurated, grew, its intellect grew with it, and at last began to ask questions and propose difficulties, which *catenæ* and commentaries could not solve. Hard-headed objectors were not to be subdued by the reverence for antiquity and the amenities of polite literature; and, when controversies arose, the Benedictines found themselves, from the necessity of the times, called to duties which were as uncongenial to the spirit of their founder as the political engagements of St. Dunstan or St. Bernard. Nor must it be supposed that the other parts of Christendom did not furnish matters demanding their theological acumen, even though none had arisen in the Frankish churches themselves. And here, we conceive, we have this remarkable confirmation of the identity of the Benedictine character, that, in proportion as these matters were in substance already decided by the Fathers, they acquitted themselves well in the controversy, and in proportion as these matters demanded some original explanations, the monastic disputants were less successful. And in speaking of them, we speak of course of their age itself, of which they were leading teachers, and which they represent. And we speak, not of individual monks, who would have the natural talents, the intellectual acuteness and subtlety of other men, but of the action of the monasteries, considered as bodies and historically, which is the true measure of the mental discipline to which their Rule subjected them. We speak of those whose duty lay, by virtue of their vocation, not in confronting doubts but in suppressing them, and who were not likely on the whole to succeed in exercises of reason in which they had no practice.

One of the countries to which we allude, as being at the era of Charlemagne the seat of theological error, was Spain, then under the power of the Saracens. The victorious infidels, in spite of their general toleration of Catholicism, of course could not avoid inflicting on it the most serious injuries. One of these was the decay or destruction of its schools,¹ and the want of education in its priesthood, which was the consequence. Another

¹ "The Spanish Latin of that period was unquestionably extremely corrupt."—Neander, *Hist.*, vol. vi. p. 118.

injury lay in the circumstance that Mahometanism, being a misbelief or heresy, more than a direct denial of the faith, seemed to have a right to interfere with it, and had a tendency to corrupt it by the insinuation of its own opinions and traditions about Christian facts and doctrines. Mahomet is said to have been indebted to the teaching of a Nestorian monk, and the demolition of images was one of the watchwords of his armies. Now, from Spain at this time proceeded the heresy of the Adoptionists, which is of a Nestorian character; and it was in Spain that Claudius of Turin matured those uncatholic opinions, especially on the subject of images, which have given him a place in ecclesiastical history.

The conflict with Nestorianism had been completed long before the time of Charlemagne; accordingly the theologians of the age, in refuting it, had but to repeat the arguments which they found ready for them in the pages of the Fathers. Alcuin was one of those who undertook the controversy, and proved himself abundantly prepared for the work. "Paulinus and Alcuin," says Professor Döllinger, "proved their point with a degree of theological acumen, and with a knowledge of the Fathers, which in that age may surprise us."¹

Such was their success, when the doctrine in question had already been defined; but, on the other hand, the question with which Claudius's name is connected, the honour due to images, was still *sub judice*, and when the ecumenical decision came from Nicæa, from whatever cause, the Franks misunderstood and disputed it. The same great council of Frankfort, which condemned the Adoptionists, acted as a protection to the Iconoclasts of Constantinople. We are far indeed from insinuating that the Fathers of the Frankish churches really differed from the definition which came to them from the East; but even for a century afterwards those churches regarded it, to say the least, with dissatisfaction.

Meanwhile the spirit of inquiry was alive and operative even within the hearts of these peaceful monastic communities themselves. We find it, as it would seem, in one of the immediate

¹ Cox's Translation, vol. iii. p. 60.

friends and pupils of Alcuin. Fridegis, of the school of York, to whom he addressed various of his letters and works, and whom he made his successor at Tours, has left behind him an argumentative fragment of so strange a nature that it has been thought a mere exercise in disputation and not a portion of a serious work.¹ He starts moreover with a proposition in favour of the supremacy of reason as contrasted with authority, which, though admitting of a Catholic explanation, is capable also of being made the basis of a philosophy to which we shall immediately have occasion to allude.² Soon after, Gotteschalch, a monk of Orbais, taught that the decree of divine predestination has direct reference to the lost as well as the saved; and about the same time Ratramn of the monastery of Corbie opposed the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. But these intellectual movements within the Benedictine territory were eclipsed by a manifestation of the sceptical spirit which came from a country, where from its prevalent religious temperament such a phenomenon was little to have been expected.

There was a portion of the Western Church which had never been included in the Roman Empire, and but partially, if at all, included within the range of the Benedictine discipline. While that discipline made its way northward, became the instrument of Anglo-Saxon conversion, and even supplanted the rule of Columban in the French monasteries, the countrymen of Columban remained faithful to their old monachism, descended southwards a second time, and retaliated on the convents of the Continent by a fresh introduction of themselves and their traditions. At this period, whatever may have been their literary attainments, they were more remarkable for a bold independence of mind, a curiosity, activity, and vigour of thought, which contrasted strongly with the genius of Bede and Raban. Their strength lay in those exercises of pure reason which go by the name of "philosophy," or of "wisdom." Thus in an ancient writer the Irish Scots are spoken of as "*sophia clari*."³

¹ Vide *Ittig. Biblioth.*, p. 313.

² Vide Neander, vol. vi. p. 161; Baluz., *Miscell.*, t. ii. p. 56.

³ Brucker, *Philos.*, t. iii. p. 574.

By Heric of Auxerre, in the passage so often quoted, they are described as "*philosophorum greges*," venturing across the stormy sea to the wide continent of Europe. And so in the legendary account, by a monk of St. Gall, of the Irish scholars who accosted the Frankish Emperor, they are represented as crying out, "Who wants *wisdom*? who will buy *wisdom*?" Dunstan, again, is said to have learned "*philosophy*" in Ireland; and Benedict of Aniane, the second founder of the Benedictines, is expressly described as looking with suspicion on their syllogistic method, which was so hostile to the habits of mind which his own Order cultivated. These Irish scholars, indeed, were too sincere Catholics, viewing them in the mass, to warrant this jealousy; but it was not without foundation, as we shall see, as regards individuals, and at least would have abundant warrant in the judgments of those who differed so much from them in mental characteristics as did the Benedictines. On the other hand, there was much in the Anglo-Saxon temper intimately congenial with the latter: then, as now, the occupants of the British soil seem to have been practical rather than speculative, fond of hard work rather than of hard thought, tenacious of what they had received, jealous of novelty, the champions of law and order. Thus the English and Irish may be said so far to represent respectively the two great Orders which came in succession on the stage of ecclesiastical history; and, as they were not without their collisions at home, so we detect some instances, and may conjecture others, of their rivalry as missionaries and teachers in central Europe. We read, for instance, in the history of St. Boniface, that one of his antagonists in his organisation of the Churches which he had founded in Germany, was an Irish priest of the name of Clement. Boniface relates, if his account is to be received to the letter, that this priest neither allowed the authority of Jerome, Augustin, or Gregory, nor of the sacred canons; that he maintained the marriage of bishops; argued from Scripture in defence of marriage with a sister-in-law, and taught a sort of universalism. Another Irishman, with whom Boniface had a quarrel, was Virgil, afterwards Bishop of Salzburg, who has been acknowledged, as well

as Boniface, for a saint. He offended Boniface by maintaining what seems like a doctrine of the existence of *antipodes*.

The antagonism between the two schools extended into the next century. Of course John Scotus Erigena, whom Charles the Bald placed in the chair of Alcuin in the School of the Palace, is the palmary specimen of the philosophical party among the Irish monks. This remarkable man, while acknowledging the authority of Revelation, laid it down as a first principle of his speculations, as Fridegis had done before him, that reason must come first, and authority second. Such a proposition indeed was faulty only in its application; for St. Austin himself had laid it down in his treatise *De Ordine*. It is self-evident that we should not know what was Revelation and what was not, unless we used our reason to decide the point. Whatever we are obliged in the event to learn from external sources, our process of inquiry must begin from within. The ancient Father whom we have mentioned propounds both the principle and the sense in which it is true. "We learn things necessarily in two ways," he says, "by authority and by reason. *Tempore auctoritas, re autem ratio prior est*;" but Erigena, as is generally agreed, accounted reason, not only as the ultimate basis of religious truth, but the direct and proper warrant for it; and, armed with this principle, he proceeded to take part in the two controversies which we have already had occasion to mention, the Predestinarian and the Eucharistic. "The writings have come to us," says the church of Lyons, speaking of his tendencies, like Clement's, to universalism, "the writings have come to us, vaniloqui et garruli hominis, who, disputing on divine prescience and predestination with human, or, as he boasts, philosophical reasonings, without any deference to Scripture, or regard to the authority of the Holy Fathers, has dared to define by his own independent assertion what is to be held and followed." Thus Erigena adopted Clement's argumentative basis, as well as his doctrine. His views upon reason and authority are distinctly avowed in the first book of his work *De divisione naturæ*. "You are not ignorant," he argues, "that what is *prius natura* ranks higher than what is *prius tempore*.

We have been taught," referring apparently to St. Austin, "that reason is prior in nature, authority in time ; now, whereas nature was created together with time, authority did not begin with the beginning of time and nature ; on the other hand, reason had its origin with nature and time in the first beginning of things." The Scholar replies to him, "Reason itself teaches this ; for authority has proceeded from right reason, reason by no means from authority. For all authority which is not approved by right reason is weak ; whereas right reason, when it is fortified in its own strength, settled and immovable, need not be corroborated by the concurrence of any authority" (lib. i. n. 71). In like manner, in the commencement of his work on Predestination, while appealing to St. Austin, he makes philosophy and religion convertible terms.¹

Erigena was succeeded in the Schola Palatii by Mannon, who inherited his master's philosophy. He himself had called Plato the greatest of philosophers, and Aristotle the most subtle of investigators ; and, according to the testimony of Friar Bacon, he was a successful interpreter of the latter writer ; and Mannon, in like manner, has left commentaries on Plato's *De Legibus* and *De Republica* and on Aristotle's *Ethics*. About the same time flourished in France another Irishman, named Macarius ; and he too showed the same leaning towards pantheism which has been imputed to Erigena.² From him this error was introduced into the monastery of Corbie. At a later date we hear of one Patrick, who from his name may be considered as an Irishman, holding the same heterodox opinion about the Eucharist which Ratramn and Erigena advanced.³

As to the two controversies, which have been mentioned more than once, while they exemplify to us the *scholasticismus ante scholasticos* then in action, they afford fresh illustrations also of the insufficiency of such instruments as the Church at that time had in her service, to meet this formidable antagonist of her religious supremacy. No mind equal to Erigena appeared on the side of traditional teaching ; and the vigour with which

¹ Guizot, *Civil.*, t. ii. p. 375. ² Lanigan, *Hist.*, vol. iii. p. 320.

³ *Vide* Rather., *Ep. apud Dach. Spic.*, t. i. p. 375.

the Adoptionists were condemned and the *Filioque* inserted in the Creed, did not manifest itself in the dealing of the Frankish Synods with the bold doctrine of Gotteschalch and Ratramn. Gotteschalch, as we have said, was a monk of Orbais. We suddenly find him asserting categorically that the reprobate have been predestined to damnation from eternity. Raban and the Synod of Mentz condemned this doctrine. Hincmar and the Synod of Quiercy condemn it also; and Pardulus, Bishop of Laon, writes against it. Then Lupus writes, if not in defence of Gotteschalch, at least not in accordance with Hincmar, who, in distress for a champion, has recourse to no other than Erigena, and Erigena, as might be expected from what has been said above, proceeded to commit himself to an extreme doctrine of universalism, as Gotteschalch had to an extreme predestinarianism. Upon this, Florus and Prudentius write against Erigena; and Remigius, explaining or espousing the thesis of Gotteschalch, writes against the three Epistles of Raban, Hincmar, and Pardulus. Hincmar replies in a second Synod of Quiercy; and the Bishops of Lorraine rejoin in the Synod of Valence. The controversy ceases rather than terminates at the Synod of Savonnières, in which all parties were represented, and in which four important articles were received, bearing indirectly on the subject of dispute, but leaving without distinct notice the original position of Gotteschalch.

In the eucharistic controversy, which lasted through several centuries, the Benedictine Paschasius, supported by Haimo, Hincmar, and Ratherius, expounded the traditionary doctrine afterwards defined; but his statements were met by the dissent, or the hesitation, as it would appear, of men of his own schools, Raban, Ratramn, Amalarius, Heribald, Heriger, Druthmar, and Florus. At the end of two centuries indeed appeared the great Benedictines, Lanfranc and Anselm, who dealt successfully with this as well as other controversies. But it must be recollected that, although their school of Bec is confessedly the historical fountainhead of the new theology which was making its way into Christendom, it is as little a fair specimen of the Benedictine character in matters of teaching, as such imperial minds as

their brother-monk and contemporary, Hildebrand, can fairly represent their institute in ecclesiastical politics.

And thus the period, properly Benedictine, ended ; this honour being shown by Providence to the great Order from which it is named, in reward for its long and patient services to religion, that, though its monks were not to be immediately employed by the Church in the special sense in which they had been her ministers for some hundreds of years, still they should be the first to point out, and they should hansomel, those new weapons, which an Order of a different genius was destined to wield against a new description of opponents.

Nor is it without significancy that the Anglo-Saxon Church, itself the creation of the Benedictines, and the seat from which their influence went out for the education or conversion of Europe from the Baltic to the Bay of Biscay, should have its share in this honour ; and that, as Theodore was brought all the way from Tarsus to Canterbury, so Lanfranc from Lombardy, and Anselm from Piedmont, should successively fill the archiepiscopal throne of Theodore.

THE END.

The Makers of British Art.

EDITED BY JAMES A. MANSON.

A NEW SERIES OF MONOGRAPHS OF BRITISH ARTISTS.

Each volume illustrated with Twenty Full-page Reproductions
and a Photogravure Portrait.

Square Crown 8vo, Cloth, Gilt Top, Deckled Edges, 3s. 6d. net.

LANDSEER, SIR EDWIN. By the EDITOR.

“It is a book very pleasantly got up.”—*The Times*.

“A very bright and readable volume, replete with anecdotes and full of interesting miscellaneous matter.”—*Dundee Advertiser*.

REYNOLDS, SIR JOSHUA. By ELSA D'ESTERRE
KEELING.

TURNER, J. M. W. By ROBERT CHIGNELL, Author
of “The Life and Paintings of Vicat Cole, R.A.”

ROMNEY, GEORGE. By SIR HERBERT MAXWELL,
Bart., F.R.S., M.P.

CONSTABLE, JOHN. By the Right Hon. LORD
WINDSOR.

MILLAIS, SIR JOHN EVERETT. By J. EADIE REID,
Author of “The Schools and Methods of Christian
Art.”

WILKIE, SIR DAVID. By PROFESSOR BAYNE.

London: THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., LTD.

BOOKS OF FAIRY TALES.

Crown 8vo, Cloth Elegant, Price 3/6 per Vol.

ENGLISH FAIRY AND OTHER FOLK TALES.

Selected and Edited, with an Introduction,

By EDWIN SIDNEY HARTLAND.

With Twelve Full-Page Illustrations by CHARLES E. BROCK.

SCOTTISH FAIRY AND FOLK TALES.

Selected and Edited, with an Introduction,

By SIR GEORGE DOUGLAS, BART.

With Twelve Full-Page Illustrations by JAMES TORRANCE

IRISH FAIRY AND FOLK TALES.

Selected and Edited, with an Introduction,

By W. B. YEATS.

With Twelve Full-Page Illustrations by JAMES TORRANCE

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED.
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

THE SCOTT LIBRARY.

Cloth, Uncut Edges, Gilt Top. Price 1s. 6d. per Volume.

VOLUMES ALREADY ISSUED—

- 1 MALORY'S ROMANCE OF KING ARTHUR AND THE Quest of the Holy Grail. Edited by Ernest Rhys.
- 2 THOREAU'S WALDEN. WITH INTRODUCTORY NOTE by Will H. Dircks.
- 3 THOREAU'S "WEEK." WITH PREFATORY NOTE BY Will H. Dircks.
- 4 THOREAU'S ESSAYS. EDITED, WITH AN INTRODUCTION, by Will H. Dircks.
- 5 CONFESSIONS OF AN ENGLISH OPIUM-EATER, ETC. By Thomas De Quincey. With Introductory Note by William Sharp.
- 6 LANDOR'S IMAGINARY CONVERSATIONS. SELECTED, with Introduction, by Havelock Ellis.
- 7 PLUTARCH'S LIVES (LANGHORNE). WITH INTRODUCTORY Note by B. J. Snell, M.A.
- 8 BROWNE'S RELIGIO MEDICI, ETC. WITH INTRODUCTION by J. Addington Symonds.
- 9 SHELLEY'S ESSAYS AND LETTERS. EDITED, WITH Introductory Note, by Ernest Rhys.
- 10 SWIFT'S PROSE WRITINGS. CHOSEN AND ARRANGED, with Introduction, by Walter Lewin.
- 11 MY STUDY WINDOWS. BY JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL. With Introduction by R. Garnett, LL.D.
- 12 LOWELL'S ESSAYS ON THE ENGLISH POETS. WITH a new Introduction by Mr. Lowell.
- 13 THE BIGLOW PAPERS. BY JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL. With a Prefatory Note by Ernest Rhys.
- 14 GREAT ENGLISH PAINTERS. SELECTED FROM Cunningham's *Lives*. Edited by William Sharp.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

THE SCOTT LIBRARY—continued.

- 15 BYRON'S LETTERS AND JOURNALS. SELECTED,
with Introduction, by Mathilde Blind.
- 16 LEIGH HUNT'S ESSAYS. WITH INTRODUCTION AND
Notes by Arthur Symonds.
- 17 LONGFELLOW'S "HYPERION," "KAVANAGH," AND
"The Trouveres." With Introduction by W. Tirebuck.
- 18 GREAT MUSICAL COMPOSERS. BY G. F. FERRIS.
Edited, with Introduction, by Mrs. William Sharp.
- 19 THE MEDITATIONS OF MARCUS AURELIUS. EDITED
by Alice Zimmern.
- 20 THE TEACHING OF EPICTETUS. TRANSLATED FROM
the Greek, with Introduction and Notes, by T. W. Rolleston.
- 21 SELECTIONS FROM SENECA. WITH INTRODUCTION
by Walter Clode.
- 22 SPECIMEN DAYS IN AMERICA. BY WALT WHITMAN.
Revised by the Author, with fresh Preface.
- 23 DEMOCRATIC VISTAS, AND OTHER PAPERS. BY
Walt Whitman. (Published by arrangement with the Author.)
- 24 WHITE'S NATURAL HISTORY OF SELBORNE. WITH
a Preface by Richard Jefferies.
- 25 DEFOE'S CAPTAIN SINGLETON. EDITED, WITH
Introduction, by H. Halliday Sparling.
- 26 MAZZINI'S ESSAYS: LITERARY, POLITICAL, AND
Religious. With Introduction by William Clarke.
- 27 PROSE WRITINGS OF HEINE. WITH INTRODUCTION
by Havelock Ellis.
- 28 REYNOLDS'S DISCOURSES. WITH INTRODUCTION
by Helen Zimmern.
- 29 PAPERS OF STEELE AND ADDISON. EDITED BY
Walter Lewin.
- 30 BURNS'S LETTERS. SELECTED AND ARRANGED,
with Introduction, by J. Logie Robertson, M.A.
- 31 VOLSUNGA SAGA. WILLIAM MORRIS. WITH INTRO-
duction by H. H. Sparling.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

THE SCOTT LIBRARY—continued.

- 32 SARTOR RESARTUS. BY THOMAS CARLYLE. WITH
Introduction by Ernest Rhys.
- 33 SELECT WRITINGS OF EMERSON. WITH INTRO-
duction by Percival Chubb.
- 34 AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF LORD HERBERT. EDITED,
with an Introduction, by Will H. Dircks.
- 35 ENGLISH PROSE, FROM MAUNDEVILLE TO
Thackeray. Chosen and Edited by Arthur Galton.
- 36 THE PILLARS OF SOCIETY, AND OTHER PLAYS. BY
Henrik Ibsen. Edited, with an Introduction, by Havelock Ellis.
- 37 IRISH FAIRY AND FOLK TALES. EDITED AND
Selected by W. B. Yeats.
- 38 ESSAYS OF DR. JOHNSON, WITH BIOGRAPHICAL
Introduction and Notes by Stuart J. Reid.
- 39 ESSAYS OF WILLIAM HAZLITT. SELECTED AND
Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Frank Carr.
- 40 LANDOR'S PENTAMERON, AND OTHER IMAGINARY
Conversations. Edited, with a Preface, by H. Ellis.
- 41 POE'S TALES AND ESSAYS. EDITED, WITH INTRO-
duction, by Ernest Rhys.
- 42 VICAR OF WAKEFIELD. BY OLIVER GOLDSMITH.
Edited, with Preface, by Ernest Rhys.
- 43 POLITICAL ORATIONS, FROM WENTWORTH TO
Macaulay. Edited, with Introduction, by William Clarke.
- 44 THE AUTOCRAT OF THE BREAKFAST-TABLE. BY
Oliver Wendell Holmes.
- 45 THE POET AT THE BREAKFAST-TABLE. BY OLIVER
Wendell Holmes.
- 46 THE PROFESSOR AT THE BREAKFAST-TABLE. BY
Oliver Wendell Holmes.
- 47 LORD CHESTERFIELD'S LETTERS TO HIS SON.
Selected, with Introduction, by Charles Sayle.
- 48 STORIES FROM CARLETON. SELECTED, WITH INTRO-
duction, by W. Yeats.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

THE SCOTT LIBRARY—continued.

- 49 JANE EYRE. BY CHARLOTTE BRONTË. EDITED BY
Clement K. Shorter.
- 50 ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND. EDITED BY LOTHROP
Withington, with a Preface by Dr. Furnivall.
- 51 THE PROSE WRITINGS OF THOMAS DAVIS. EDITED
by T. W. Rolleston.
- 52 SPENCE'S ANECDOTES. A SELECTION. EDITED,
with an Introduction and Notes, by John Underhill.
- 53 MORE'S UTOPIA, AND LIFE OF EDWARD V. EDITED,
with an Introduction, by Maurice Adams.
- 54 SADÏ'S GULISTAN, OR FLOWER GARDEN. TRANS-
lated, with an Essay, by James Ross.
- 55 ENGLISH FAIRY AND FOLK TALES. EDITED BY
E. Sidney Hartland.
- 56 NORTHERN STUDIES. BY EDMUND GOSSE. WITH
a Note by Ernest Rhys.
- 57 EARLY REVIEWS OF GREAT WRITERS. EDITED BY
E. Stevenson.
- 58 ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS. WITH GEORGE HENRY
Lewes's Essay on Aristotle prefixed.
- 59 LANDOR'S PERICLES AND ASPASIA. EDITED, WITH
an Introduction, by Havelock Ellis.
- 60 ANNALS OF TACITUS. THOMAS GORDON'S TRANS-
lation. Edited, with an Introduction, by Arthur Galton.
- 61 ESSAYS OF ELIA. BY CHARLES LAMB. EDITED,
with an Introduction, by Ernest Rhys.
- 62 BALZAC'S SHORTER STORIES. TRANSLATED BY
William Wilson and the Count Stenbock.
- 63 COMEDIES OF DE MUSSET. EDITED, WITH AN
Introductory Note, by S. L. Gwynn.
- 64 CORAL REEFS. BY CHARLES DARWIN. EDITED,
with an Introduction, by Dr. J. W. Williams.
- 65 SHERIDAN'S PLAYS. EDITED, WITH AN INTRO-
duction, by Rudolf Direks.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

THE SCOTT LIBRARY—continued.

- 66 OUR VILLAGE. BY MISS MITFORD. EDITED, WITH
an Introduction, by Ernest Rhys.
- 67 MASTER HUMPHREY'S CLOCK, AND OTHER STORIES.
By Charles Dickens. With Introduction by Frank T. Marzials.
- 68 TALES FROM WONDERLAND. BY RUDOLPH
Baumbach. Translated by Helen B. Dole.
- 69 ESSAYS AND PAPERS BY DOUGLAS JERROLD. EDITED
by Walter Jerrold.
- 70 VINDICATION OF THE RIGHTS OF WOMAN. BY
Mary Wollstonecraft. Introduction by Mrs. E. Robins Pennell.
- 71 "THE ATHENIAN ORACLE." A SELECTION. EDITED
by John Underhill, with Prefatory Note by Walter Besant.
- 72 ESSAYS OF SAINTE-BEUVE. TRANSLATED AND
Edited, with an Introduction, by Elizabeth Lee.
- 73 SELECTIONS FROM PLATO. FROM THE TRANS.
lation of Sydenham and Taylor. Edited by T. W. Rolleston.
- 74 HEINE'S ITALIAN TRAVEL SKETCHES, ETC. TRANS.
lated by Elizabeth A. Sharp. With an Introduction from the French of
Theophile Gautier.
- 75 SCHILLER'S MAID OF ORLEANS. TRANSLATED,
with an Introduction, by Major-General Patrick Maxwell.
- 76 SELECTIONS FROM SYDNEY SMITH. EDITED, WITH
an Introduction, by Ernest Rhys.
- 77 THE NEW SPIRIT. BY HAVELOCK ELLIS.
- 78 THE BOOK OF MARVELLOUS ADVENTURES. FROM
the "Morte d'Arthur." Edited by Ernest Rhys. [This, together with
No. 1, forms the complete "Morte d'Arthur."]
- 79 ESSAYS AND APHORISMS. BY SIR ARTHUR HELPS
With an Introduction by E. A. Helps.
- 80 ESSAYS OF MONTAIGNE. SELECTED, WITH A
Prefatory Note, by Percival Chubb.
- 81 THE LUCK OF BARRY LYNDON. BY W. M
Thackeray. Edited by F. T. Marzials.
- 82 SCHILLER'S WILLIAM TELL. TRANSLATED, WITH
an Introduction, by Major-General Patrick Maxwell.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

THE SCOTT LIBRARY—continued.

- 83 CARLYLE'S ESSAYS ON GERMAN LITERATURE.
With an Introduction by Ernest Rhys.
- 84 PLAYS AND DRAMATIC ESSAYS OF CHARLES LAMB.
Edited, with an Introduction, by Rudolf Dircks.
- 85 THE PROSE OF WORDSWORTH. SELECTED AND
Edited, with an Introduction, by Professor William Knight.
- 86 ESSAYS, DIALOGUES, AND THOUGHTS OF COUNT
Giacomo Leopardi. Translated, with an Introduction and Notes, by
Major-General Patrick Maxwell.
- 87 THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL. A RUSSIAN COMEDY.
By Nikolai V. Gogol. Translated from the original, with an Introduction
and Notes, by Arthur A. Sykes.
- 88 ESSAYS AND APOTHEGMS OF FRANCIS, LORD BACON.
Edited, with an Introduction, by John Buchan.
- 89 PROSE OF MILTON. SELECTED AND EDITED, WITH
an Introduction, by Richard Garnett, LL.D.
- 90 THE REPUBLIC OF PLATO. TRANSLATED BY
Thomas Taylor, with an Introduction by Theodore Wratlaw.
- 91 PASSAGES FROM FROISSART. WITH AN INTRO-
duction by Frank T. Marzials.
- 92 THE PROSE AND TABLE TALK OF COLERIDGE.
Edited by Will H. Dircks.
- 93 HEINE IN ART AND LETTERS. TRANSLATED BY
Elizabeth A. Sharp.
- 94 SELECTED ESSAYS OF DE QUINCEY. WITH AN
Introduction by Sir George Douglas, Bart.
- 95 VASARI'S LIVES OF ITALIAN PAINTERS. SELECTED
and Prefaced by Havelock Ellis.
- 96 LAOCOON, AND OTHER PROSE WRITINGS OF
LESSING. A new Translation by W. B. Rönnefeldt.
- 97 PELLEAS AND MELISANDA, AND THE SIGHTLESS.
Two Plays by Maurice Maeterlinck. Translated from the French by
Laurence Alma Tadema.
- 98 THE COMPLETE ANGLER OF WALTON AND COTTON.
Edited, with an Introduction, by Charles Hill Dick.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

THE SCOTT LIBRARY—continued.

- 99 LESSING'S NATHAN THE WISE. TRANSLATED BY Major-General Patrick Maxwell.
 - 100 THE POETRY OF THE CELTIC RACES, AND OTHER Essays of Ernest Renan. Translated by W. G. Hutchison.
 - 101 CRITICISMS, REFLECTIONS, AND MAXIMS OF GOETHE. Translated, with an Introduction, by W. B. Rönnefeldt.
 - 102 ESSAYS OF SCHOPENHAUER. TRANSLATED BY Mrs. Rudolf Dircks. With an Introduction.
 - 103 RENAN'S LIFE OF JESUS. TRANSLATED, WITH AN Introduction, by William G. Hutchison.
 - 104 THE CONFESSIONS OF SAINT AUGUSTINE. EDITED, with an Introduction, by Arthur Symonds.
 - 105 THE PRINCIPLES OF SUCCESS IN LITERATURE. By George Henry Lewes. Edited, with an Introduction, by T. Sharper Knowlson.
 - 106 THE LIVES OF DR. JOHN DONNE, SIR HENRY WOTTON, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert, and Dr. Robert Sanderson. By Isaac Walton. Edited, with an Introduction, by Charles Hill Dick.
 - 107 WHAT IS ART? BY LEO TOLSTOY. TRANSLATED from the Original Russian MS., with an Introduction, by Aylmer Maude.
 - 108 RENAN'S ANTICHRIST. TRANSLATED, WITH AN Introduction, by W. G. Hutchison.
 - 109 ORATIONS OF CICERO. SELECTED AND EDITED, with an Introduction, by Fred. W. Norris.
 - 110 REFLECTIONS ON THE REVOLUTION IN FRANCE. By Edmund Burke. With an Introduction by George Sampson.
 - 111 THE LETTERS OF THE YOUNGER PLINY. SERIES I. Translated, with an Introductory Essay, by John B. Firth, B.A., Late Scholar of Queen's College, Oxford.
 - 112 THE LETTERS OF THE YOUNGER PLINY. SERIES II. Translated by John B. Firth, B.A.
 - 113 SELECTED THOUGHTS OF BLAISE PASCAL. TRANSLATED and Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by Gertrude Burford Rawlings.
 - 114 SCOTS ESSAYISTS: FROM STIRLING TO STEVENSON. Edited, with an Introduction, by Oliphant Smeaton.
 - 115 ON LIBERTY. BY JOHN STUART MILL. WITH AN Introduction by W. L. Courtney.
 - 116 THE DISCOURSE ON METHOD AND METAPHYSICAL Meditations of René Descartes. Translated by Gertrude Burford Rawlings.
- NEW VOLUME.**
- 117 KÂLIDÂSA'S SAKUNTALÂ, ETC. EDITED, WITH AN Introduction, by T. Holme.

Other Volumes in preparation.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

A BOOK FOR EVERY DINNER TABLE.

Musicians' Wit, Humour, and Anecdote:

BEING

ON DITS OF COMPOSERS, SINGERS, AND
INSTRUMENTALISTS OF ALL TIMES.

BY

FREDERICK J. CROWEST,

*Author of "The Great Tone Poets," "The Story of British Music,"
Editor of "The Master Musicians" Series, etc., etc.*

Profusely Illustrated with Quaint Drawings by
J. P. DONNE.

In One Volume—Crown 8vo, Cloth, Richly Gilt, Price 3/6.

Among the hundreds of stories abounding in wit and pointed repartee which the volume contains, will be found anecdotes of famous musicians of all countries and periods.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

IBSEN'S PROSE DRAMAS.

EDITED BY WILLIAM ARCHER.

Complete in Five Vols. Crown 8vo, Cloth, Price 3/6 each.

Set of Five Vols., in Case, 17/6; in Half Morocco, in Case, 32/6

"We seem at last to be shown men and women as they are; and at first it is more than we can endure. . . . All Ibsen's characters speak and act as if they were hypnotised, and under their creator's imperious demand to reveal themselves. There never was such a mirror held up to nature before: it is too terrible. . . . Yet we must return to Ibsen, with his remorseless surgery, his remorseless electric-light, until we, too, have grown strong and learned to face the naked—if necessary, the flayed and bleeding—reality."—SPEAKER (London).

VOL. I. "A DOLL'S HOUSE," "THE LEAGUE OF YOUTH," and "THE PILLARS OF SOCIETY." With Portrait of the Author, and Biographical Introduction by WILLIAM ARCHER.

VOL. II. "GHOSTS," "AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE," and "THE WILD DUCK." With an Introductory Note.

VOL. III. "LADY INGER OF ÖSTRÅT," "THE VIKINGS AT HELGELAND," "THE PRETENDERS." With an Introductory Note and Portrait of Ibsen.

VOL. IV. "EMPEROR AND GALILEAN." With an Introductory Note by WILLIAM ARCHER.

VOL. V. "ROSMERSHOLM," "THE LADY FROM THE SEA," "HEDDA GABLER." Translated by WILLIAM ARCHER. With an Introductory Note.

The sequence of the plays in each volume is chronological; the complete set of volumes comprising the dramas thus presents them in chronological order.

"The art of prose translation does not perhaps enjoy a very high literary status in England, but we have no hesitation in numbering the present version of Ibsen, so far as it has gone (Vols. I. and II.), among the very best achievements, in that kind, of our generation."—*Academy*.

"We have seldom, if ever, met with a translation so absolutely idiomatic."—*Glasgow Herald*.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

COMPACT AND PRACTICAL.

In Limp Cloth ; for the Pocket. Price One Shilling.

THE EUROPEAN CONVERSATION BOOKS.

FRENCH

ITALIAN

SPANISH

GERMAN

NORWEGIAN

CONTENTS.

Hints to Travellers—Everyday Expressions—Arriving at and Leaving a Railway Station—Custom House Enquiries—In a Train—At a Buffet and Restaurant—At an Hotel—Paying an Hotel Bill—Enquiries in a Town—On Board Ship—Embarking and Disembarking—Excursion by Carriage—Enquiries as to Diligences—Enquiries as to Boats—Engaging Apartments—Washing List and Days of Week—Restaurant Vocabulary—Telegrams and Letters, etc., etc.

The contents of these little handbooks are so arranged as to permit direct and immediate reference. All dialogues or enquiries not considered absolutely essential have been purposely excluded, nothing being introduced which might confuse the traveller rather than assist him. A few hints are given in the introduction which will be found valuable to those unaccustomed to foreign travel.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

Crown 8vo, about 350 pp. each, Cloth Cover, 2/6 per Vol.;
Half-Polished Morocco, Gilt Top, 5s.

Count Tolstoy's Works.

The following Volumes are already issued—

A RUSSIAN PROPRIETOR.
THE COSSACKS.
IVAN ILYITCH, AND OTHER
STORIES.
MY RELIGION.
LIFE.
MY CONFESSION.
CHILDHOOD, BOYHOOD,
YOUTH.
THE PHYSIOLOGY OF WAR.
ANNA KARÉNINA. 3/6.

WHAT TO DO?
WAR AND PEACE. (4 vols.)
THE LONG EXILE, ETC.
SEVASTOPOL.
THE KREUTZER SONATA, AND
FAMILY HAPPINESS.
THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS
WITHIN YOU.
WORK WHILE YE HAVE THE
LIGHT.
THE GOSPEL IN BRIEF.

Uniform with the above—

IMPRESSIONS OF RUSSIA. By Dr. GEORG BRANDES.

Post 4to, Cloth, Price 1s.

PATRIOTISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

To which is appended a Reply to Criticisms of the Work.

By COUNT TOLSTOY.

1/- Booklets by Count Tolstoy.

Bound in White Grained Boards, with Gilt Lettering.

WHERE LOVE IS, THERE GOD
IS ALSO.
THE TWO PILGRIMS.
WHAT MEN LIVE BY.

THE GODSON.
IF YOU NEGLECT THE FIRE,
YOU DON'T PUT IT OUT.
WHAT SHALL IT PROFIT A MAN?

2/- Booklets by Count Tolstoy.

NEW EDITIONS, REVISED.

Small 12mo, Cloth, with Embossed Design on Cover, each containing
Two Stories by Count Tolstoy, and Two Drawings by
H. R. Millar. In Box, Price 2s. each.

Volume I. contains—
WHERE LOVE IS, THERE GOD
IS ALSO.
THE GODSON.

Volume II. contains—
WHAT MEN LIVE BY.
WHAT SHALL IT PROFIT A
MAN?

Volume III. contains—
THE TWO PILGRIMS.
IF YOU NEGLECT THE FIRE,
YOU DON'T PUT IT OUT.

Volume IV. contains—
MASTER AND MAN.

Volume V. contains—
TOLSTOY'S PARABLES.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

NEW ENGLAND LIBRARY.

GRAVURE EDITION.

PRINTED ON ANTIQUE PAPER. 2s. 6d. PER VOL.

Each Volume with a Frontispiece in Photogravure.

By NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE.

THE SCARLET LETTER.
THE HOUSE OF THE SEVEN GABLES.
THE BLITHEDALE ROMANCE.
TANGLEWOOD TALES.
TWICE-TOLD TALES.
A WONDER-BOOK FOR GIRLS AND BOYS.
OUR OLD HOME.
MOSSSES FROM AN OLD MANSE.
THE SNOW IMAGE.
TRUE STORIES FROM HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.
THE NEW ADAM AND EVE.
LEGENDS OF THE PROVINCE HOUSE.

By OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES.

THE AUTOCRAT OF THE BREAKFAST-TABLE.
THE PROFESSOR AT THE BREAKFAST-TABLE.
THE POET AT THE BREAKFAST-TABLE.
ELSIE VENNER.

By HENRY THOREAU.

ESSAYS AND OTHER WRITINGS.
WALDEN; OR, LIFE IN THE WOODS.
A WEEK ON THE CONCORD.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

Crown 8vo, Cloth, 3s. 6d. each; some vols., 6s.

THE CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE SERIES.

EDITED BY HAVELOCK ELLIS.

Illustrated Volumes containing between 300 and 400 pp.

- EVOLUTION OF SEX. By Professors GEDDES and THOMSON. 6s.
ELECTRICITY IN MODERN LIFE. By G. W. DE TUNZELMANN.
THE ORIGIN OF THE ARYANS. By Dr. TAYLOR.
PHYSIOGNOMY AND EXPRESSION. By P. MANTEGAZZA.
EVOLUTION AND DISEASE. By J. B. SUTTON.
THE VILLAGE COMMUNITY. By G. L. GOMME.
THE CRIMINAL. By HAVELOCK ELLIS. New Edition. 6s.
SANITY AND INSANITY. By Dr. C. MERCIER.
HYPNOTISM. By Dr. ALBERT MOLL (Berlin).
MANUAL TRAINING. By Dr. WOODWARD (St. Louis).
SCIENCE OF FAIRY TALES. By E. S. HARTLAND.
PRIMITIVE FOLK. By ELIE RECLUS.
EVOLUTION OF MARRIAGE. By CH. LETOURNEAU.
BACTERIA AND THEIR PRODUCTS. By Dr. WOODHEAD.
EDUCATION AND HEREDITY. By J. M. GUYAU.
THE MAN OF GENIUS. By Prof. LOMBROSO.
PROPERTY: ITS ORIGIN. By CH. LETOURNEAU.
VOLCANOES PAST AND PRESENT. By Prof. HULL.
PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEMS. By Dr. J. F. SYKES.
MODERN METEOROLOGY. By FRANK WALDO, Ph.D.
THE GERM-PLASM. By Professor WEISMANN. 6s.
THE INDUSTRIES OF ANIMALS. By F. HOUSSAY.
MAN AND WOMAN. By HAVELOCK ELLIS. 6s.
MODERN CAPITALISM. By JOHN A. HOBSON, M.A.
THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE. By F. PODMORE, M.A.
COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGY. By Prof. C. L. MORGAN, F.R.S. 6s.
THE ORIGINS OF INVENTION. By O. T. MASON.
THE GROWTH OF THE BRAIN. By H. H. DONALDSON.
EVOLUTION IN ART. By Prof. A. C. HADDON, F.R.S.
HALLUCINATIONS AND ILLUSIONS. By E. PARISH. 6s.
PSYCHOLOGY OF THE EMOTIONS. By Prof. RIBOT. 6s.
THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY. By Dr. E. W. SCRIPTURE. 6s.
SLEEP: ITS PHYSIOLOGY, PATHOLOGY, HYGIENE, AND PSYCHOLOGY.
By MARIE DE MANACÉINE.
THE NATURAL HISTORY OF DIGESTION. By A. LOCKHART
GILLESPIE, M.D., F.R.C.P. ED., F.R.S. ED. 6s.
DEGENERACY: ITS CAUSES, SIGNS, AND RESULTS. By Prof.
EUGENE S. TALBOT, M.D., Chicago. 6s.
THE HISTORY OF THE EUROPEAN FAUNA. By R. F.
SCHARFF, B.Sc., Ph.D., F.Z.S. 6s.
THE RACES OF MAN: A SKETCH OF ETHNOGRAPHY AND ANTHRO-
POLOGY. By J. DENIKER. 6s.
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION. By Prof. STARBUCK. 6s.
THE CHILD. By ALEXANDER FRANCIS CHAMBERLAIN, M.A., Ph.D. 6s.
THE MEDITERRANEAN RACE. By Prof. SERGI. 6s.
THE STUDY OF RELIGION. By MORRIS JASTROW, Jun., Ph.D. 6s.
HISTORY OF GEOLOGY AND PALÆONTOLOGY. By Prof.
KARL ALFRED VON ZITTEL, Munich. 6s.

SPECIAL EDITION OF THE CANTERBURY POETS.

Square 8vo, Cloth, Gilt Top Elegant, Price 2s.

Each Volume with a Frontispiece in Photogravure.

- CHRISTIAN YEAR. With Portrait of John Keble.
 LONGFELLOW. With Portrait of Longfellow.
 SHELLEY. With Portrait of Shelley.
 WORDSWORTH. With Portrait of Wordsworth.
 WHITTIER. With Portrait of Whittier.
 BURNS. Songs } With Portrait of Burns, and View of "The
 BURNS. Poems } Auld Brig o' Doon."
 KEATS. With Portrait of Keats.
 EMERSON. With Portrait of Emerson.
 SONNETS OF THIS CENTURY. Portrait of P. B. Marston.
 WHITMAN. With Portrait of Whitman.
 LOVE LETTERS OF A VIOLINIST. Portrait of Eric Mackay.
 SCOTT. Lady of the Lake, } With Portrait of Sir Walter Scott,
 etc. } and View of "The Silver
 SCOTT. Marmion, etc. } Strand, Loch Katrine."
 CHILDREN OF THE POETS. With an Engraving of "The
 Orphans," by Gainsborough.
 SONNETS OF EUROPE. With Portrait of J. A. Symonds.
 SYDNEY DOBELL. With Portrait of Sydney Dobell.
 HERRICK. With Portrait of Herrick.
 BALLADS AND RONDEAUS. Portrait of W. E. Henley.
 IRISH MINSTRELSY. With Portrait of Thomas Davis.
 PARADISE LOST. With Portrait of Milton.
 FAIRY MUSIC. Engraving from Drawing by C. E. Brock.
 GOLDEN TREASURY. With Engraving of Virgin Mother.
 AMERICAN SONNETS. With Portrait of J. R. Lowell.
 IMITATION OF CHRIST. With Engraving, "Ecce Homo."
 PAINTER POETS. With Portrait of Walter Crane.
 WOMEN POETS. With Portrait of Mrs. Browning.
 POEMS OF HON. RODEN NOEL. Portrait of Hon. R. Noel.
 AMERICAN HUMOROUS VERSE. Portrait of Mark Twain.
 SONGS OF FREEDOM. With Portrait of William Morris.
 SCOTTISH MINOR POETS. With Portrait of R. Tannahill.
 CONTEMPORARY SCOTTISH VERSE. With Portrait of
 Robert Louis Stevenson.
 PARADISE REGAINED. With Portrait of Milton.
 CAVALIER POETS. With Portrait of Suckling.
 HUMOROUS POEMS. With Portrait of Hood.
 HERBERT. With Portrait of Herbert.
 POE. With Portrait of Poe.
 OWEN MEREDITH. With Portrait of late Lord Lytton.
 LOVE LYRICS. With Portrait of Raleigh.
 GERMAN BALLADS. With Portrait of Schiller.
 CAMPBELL. With Portrait of Campbell.
 CANADIAN POEMS. With View of Mount Stephen.
 EARLY ENGLISH POETRY. With Portrait of Earl of Surrey.
 ALLAN RAMSAY. With Portrait of Ramsay.
 SPENSER. With Portrait of Spenser.

CHATTERTON. With Engraving, "The Death of Chatterton."
COWPER. With Portrait of Cowper.
CHAUCER. With Portrait of Chaucer.
COLERIDGE. With Portrait of Coleridge.
POPE. With Portrait of Pope.
BYRON. Miscellaneous } With Portraits of Byron.
BYRON. Don Juan }
JACOBITE SONGS. With Portrait of Prince Charlie.
BORDER BALLADS. With View of Neidpath Castle.
AUSTRALIAN BALLADS. With Portrait of A. L. Gordon.
HOGG. With Portrait of Hogg.
GOLDSMITH. With Portrait of Goldsmith.
MOORE. With Portrait of Moore.
DORA GREENWELL. With Portrait of Dora Greenwell.
BLAKE. With Portrait of Blake.
POEMS OF NATURE. With Portrait of Andrew Lang.
PRAED. With Portrait.
SOUTHEY. With Portrait.
HUGO. With Portrait.
GOETHE. With Portrait.
BERANGER. With Portrait.
HEINE. With Portrait.
SEA MUSIC. With View of Corbière Rocks, Jersey.
SONG-TIDE. With Portrait of Philip Bourke Marston.
LADY OF LYONS. With Portrait of Bulwer Lytton.
SHAKESPEARE : Songs and Sonnets. With Portrait.
BEN JONSON. With Portrait.
HORACE. With Portrait.
CRABBE. With Portrait.
CRADLE SONGS. With Engraving from Drawing by T. E. Macklin.
BALLADS OF SPORT. Do. do.
MATTHEW ARNOLD. With Portrait.
AUSTIN'S DAYS OF THE YEAR. With Portrait.
CLOUGH'S BOTHIE, and other Poems. With View.
BROWNING'S Pippa Passes, etc.
BROWNING'S Blot in the 'Scutcheon, etc. } With Portrait.
BROWNING'S Dramatic Lyrics. }
MACKAY'S LOVER'S MISSAL. With Portrait.
KIRKE WHITE'S POEMS. With Portrait.
LYRA NICOTIANA. With Portrait.
AURORA LEIGH. With Portrait of E. B. Browning.
NAVAL SONGS. With Portrait of Lord Nelson.
TENNYSON : In Memoriam, Maud, etc. With Portrait.
TENNYSON : English Idyls, The Princess, etc. With View of
 Farringford House.
WAR SONGS. With Portrait of Lord Roberts.
JAMES THOMSON. With Portrait.
ALEXANDER SMITH. With Portrait.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
 LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

Great Writers.

A NEW SERIES OF CRITICAL BIOGRAPHIES.

Edited by E. ROBERTSON and F. T. MARZIALS.

Cloth, Uncut Edges, Gilt Top. Price 1/6.

Longfellow	By Professor Eric S. Robertson
Coleridge	By Hall Caine
Dickens	By Frank T. Marzials
Dante Gabriel Rossetti	By J. Knight
Samuel Johnson	By Colonel F. Grant
Darwin	By G. T. Bettany
Charlotte Brontë	By A. Birrell
Carlyle	By R. Garnett, LL.D.
Adam Smith	By R. B. Haldane, M.P.
Keats	By W. M. Rossetti
Shelley	By William Sharp
Smollett	By David Hannay
Goldsmith	By Austin Dobson
Scott	By Professor Yonge
Burns	By Professor Blackie
Victor Hugo	By Frank T. Marzials
Emerson	By R. Garnett, LL.D.
Goethe	By James Sime
Congreve	By Edmund Gosse
Bunyan	By Canon Venables
Crabbe	By T. E. Kebbel
Heine	By William Sharp
Mill	By W. L. Courtney
Schiller	By Henry W. Nevinson
Marryat	By David Hannay
Lessing	By T. W. Rolleston
Milton	By R. Garnett, LL.D.
Balzac	By Frederick Wedmore
George Eliot	By Oscar Browning
Jane Austen	By Goldwin Smith
Browning	By William Sharp
Byron	By Hon. Roden Noel
Hawthorne	By Moncure D. Conway
Schopenhauer	By Professor Wallace
Sheridan	By Lloyd Sanders
Thackeray	By H. Merivale and F. T. Marzials
Cervantes	By H. E. Watts
Voltaire	By Francis Espinasse
Leigh Hunt	By Cosmo Monkhouse
Whittier	By W. J. Linton
Renan	By Francis Espinasse
Thoreau	By H. S. Salt

A Complete Bibliography to each volume, by
J. P. ANDERSON, British Museum, London.

Library Edition of "Great Writers," Demy 8vo, 2/6.

THE WALTER SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
LONDON AND NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.







